

A Comparative Study of Laplacians and Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz–Weitzenböck Identities in Riemannian and Antisymplectic Geometry

IGOR A. BATALIN^{a,b} and KLAUS BERING^{a,c}

^aThe Niels Bohr Institute
The Niels Bohr International Academy
Blegdamsvej 17
DK–2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

^bI.E. Tamm Theory Division
P.N. Lebedev Physics Institute
Russian Academy of Sciences
53 Leninsky Prospect
Moscow 119991
Russia

^cInstitute for Theoretical Physics & Astrophysics
Masaryk University
Kotlářská 2
CZ–611 37 Brno
Czech Republic

July 11, 2009

Abstract

We introduce an antisymplectic Dirac operator and antisymplectic gamma matrices. We explore similarities between, on one hand, the Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz formula for spinor bundles in Riemannian spin geometry, which contains a zeroth–order term proportional to the Levi–Civita scalar curvature, and, on the other hand, the nilpotent, Grassmann–odd, second–order Δ operator in antisymplectic geometry, which in general has a zeroth–order term proportional to the odd scalar curvature of an arbitrary antisymplectic and torsionfree connection that is compatible with the measure density. Finally, we discuss the close relationship with the two–loop scalar curvature term in the quantum Hamiltonian for a particle in a curved Riemannian space.

MSC number(s): 15A66; 53A55; 53B20; 58A50; 58C50.

Keywords: Dirac Operator; Spin Representations; BV Field–Antifield Formalism; Antisymplectic Geometry; Odd Laplacian.

^bE-mail: batalin@pi.ru

^cE-mail: bering@physics.muni.cz

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	General Remarks About Notation	5
2	General Theory	7
2.1	Connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)} = d + \Gamma$	7
2.2	Torsion	7
2.3	Divergence	8
2.4	The Riemann Curvature	8
2.5	The Ricci Tensor	9
2.6	The Ricci Two-Form	9
2.7	Covariant Tensors	9
2.8	Coordinate Transformations	10
3	Riemannian Geometry	10
3.1	Metric	10
3.2	Laplacian Δ_ρ	11
3.3	Two-cocycle $\nu(\rho'; \rho, g)$	12
3.4	Scalar ν_ρ	12
3.5	Δ And Δ_g	14
3.6	Levi-Civita Connection	15
3.7	The Riemann Curvature	16
3.8	Scalar Curvature	16
3.9	The Δ Operator At $\rho = \rho_g$	17
3.10	Particle In Curved Space	18
3.11	First-Order S^{AB} Matrices	23
3.12	Γ^A Matrices	24
3.13	C Versus Y	25
3.14	Hodge $*$ Operation	25
3.15	Hodge-Dirac Operator $D^{(T)} = d + \lambda\delta$	27
3.A	Appendix: Is There A Second-Order Formalism?	28
4	Antisymplectic Geometry	29
4.1	Metric	29
4.2	Odd Laplacian Δ_ρ	30
4.3	Odd Scalar ν_ρ	30
4.4	Δ And Δ_E	31
4.5	Antisymplectic Connection	32
4.6	The Riemann Curvature	32
4.7	Odd Scalar Curvature	33
4.8	First-Order S^{AB} Matrices	34
4.9	Γ^A Matrices	34
4.10	Dirac Operator $D^{(T)} = d + \theta\delta$	35
4.A	Appendix: Is There A Second-Order Formalism?	36
4.B	Appendix: What Is An Antisymplectic Clifford Algebra?	37

5	General Spin Theory	38
5.1	Spin Manifold	38
5.2	Spin Connection $\nabla^{(\omega)} = d + \omega$	38
5.3	Spin Curvature	40
5.4	Covariant Tensors with Flat Indices	40
5.5	Local Gauge Transformations	41
6	Riemannian Spin Geometry	41
6.1	Spin Geometry	41
6.2	Levi–Civita Spin Connection	42
6.3	First–Order s^{ab} Matrices	42
6.4	γ^a Matrices And Clifford Algebras	43
6.5	Dirac Operator $D^{(s)}$	45
6.6	Second–Order σ^{ab} Matrices	45
6.7	Lichnerowicz’ Formula	46
6.8	Clifford Representations	47
6.9	Intertwining Operator	48
6.10	Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz’ Formula	50
7	Antisymplectic Spin Geometry	50
7.1	Spin Geometry	50
7.2	First–Order s^{ab} Matrices	51
7.3	γ^a Matrices	51
7.4	Dirac Operator $D^{(s)}$	52
7.A	Appendix: Shifted s'^{ab}_+ Matrices	52
8	Conclusions	53

1 Introduction

What do Riemannian and antisymplectic geometry have in common? The short answer is that out of the $2 \times 2 = 4$ classical classes of even and odd, Riemannian and symplectic geometries, they are the only two possibilities that possess non–trivial Laplacians, scalar curvatures and Weitzenböck–type identities, cf. Table 1. Our present investigation is partly spurred by the following remarkable fact. On one hand, one has the nilpotent, Grassmann–odd Δ operator, which plays a fundamental rôle in antisymplectic geometry, and which helps encode the BRST symmetry in the field–antifield formalism [1, 2, 3]. It can be written as [4]

$$2\Delta = 2\Delta_\rho - \frac{R}{4} \quad (\text{antisymplectic}) \quad (1.0.1)$$

where Δ_ρ is the odd Laplacian, and R is the odd scalar curvature of an arbitrary antisymplectic, torsionfree and ρ –compatible connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)} = d + \Gamma$. On the other hand, on a Riemannian spin manifold, one has the Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz formula [5, 6]

$$D^{(\sigma)} D^{(\sigma)} = \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma)} - \frac{R}{4} \quad (\text{Riemannian}) \quad (1.0.2)$$

where $D^{(\sigma)}$ is the Dirac operator, $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma)}$ is the spinor Laplacian, and R is the scalar Levi–Civita curvature. The formula (1.0.1) has been multiplied with a factor of 2 to ease comparison with formula (1.0.2) because of the standard practice to normalize odd Laplacians with an internal factor 1/2. In

both formulas (1.0.1) and (1.0.2), the coefficient in front of the zeroth-order scalar curvature term is exactly the same, namely minus a quarter! Of course, there are crucial differences between eqs. (1.0.1) and (1.0.2). The second-order operators in eq. (1.0.1) act on scalar functions, while the Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma)}$ and the Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma)}$ in eq. (1.0.2) act on spinors, as the index “ σ ” is meant to indicate. (The subscript $\rho_g \equiv \sqrt{g}$ refers to the canonical Riemannian density.)

Our investigation can roughly be divided in three parts. The first part (which is mainly covered in Subsections 3.1–3.5, 3.9 and 4.1–4.4) is to define a Grassmann-even Riemannian analogue of the odd Δ operator (1.0.1), that takes scalars in scalars:

$$\Delta_{\rho_g} - \frac{R}{4} \quad (\text{Riemannian}) . \quad (1.0.3)$$

Here Δ_{ρ_g} is the Laplace–Beltrami operator and R is the Levi–Civita scalar curvature. The zeroth-order term $-R/4$ in the even operator (1.0.3) is special in several ways (as compared to other choices of the zeroth-order term). For instance, the even operator (1.0.3) with this particular zeroth-order term $-R/4$ is closely related to the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ for a particle moving in the Riemannian manifold [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], cf. Subsection 3.10. Central to our investigation is the fact that the zeroth-order term $-R/4$ also possesses a special mathematical property. To see this property, one notes that it is possible to uniquely identify how all zeroth-order terms depend on the canonical Riemannian density ρ_g , due to a classification of scalar invariants, see Proposition 3.2. Therefore it is possible to consistently replace all the appearances of ρ_g with an arbitrary density ρ . One may now show that the ρ -lifted version of the operator (1.0.3) is the unique operator such that the $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated operator is independent of ρ . That’s the special property. This has parallels to antisymplectic geometry, where the odd Δ operator (1.0.1) shares a similar characterization. In antisymplectic geometry, the $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated operator

$$\Delta_E = \sqrt{\rho} \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \quad (\text{antisymplectic}) \quad (1.0.4)$$

is precisely Khudaverdian’s Δ_E operator [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. The Δ_E operator (1.0.4) is distinguished by being nilpotent and independent of ρ . In fact, when one tracks the equations in detail, it is possible to see that the same coefficient $-1/4$ in front of the odd and even scalar curvature terms in eqs. (1.0.1) and (1.0.3) is not a coincidence, but indeed follows from the same underlying principle of ρ -independence. Thus it establishes a bridge between the odd and even operators (1.0.1) and (1.0.3).

We should also mention that the even operator (1.0.3) is often compared with the conformally covariant Laplacian

$$\Delta_{\rho_g} - \frac{(N-2)R}{(N-1)4} \quad (\text{Riemannian}) \quad (1.0.5)$$

where $N = \dim(M)$ is the dimension of the Riemannian manifold M . The zeroth-order term $-R/4$ corresponds to $N = \infty$.

The second part (which is covered in Subsections 6.4–6.10) is to check within Riemannian geometry, if there is a bridge between the even operator (1.0.3) that acts on scalar functions, and the square of the Dirac operator (1.0.2) that acts on the spinor bundle $\mathcal{S}$. There is a well-defined group-theoretical procedure how to compare scalars and spinors. Firstly, the Dirac operator is extended to a Dirac operator that acts on the bispinor bundle $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}^T$. The Clebsch–Gordan decomposition $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}^T = \underline{1} \oplus \dots$, in turn, contains a singlet representation, *i.e.*, a scalar invariant, which is denoted as $||s\rangle\rangle$. Thus one just has to project the square of the bispinor Dirac operator to the singlet representation to obtain an operator that acts on scalars. Somewhat surprisingly, the operator turns out to be just

the bare Laplace–Beltrami operator Δ_{ρ_g} with *no* zeroth–order term at all, cf. Theorem 6.6. Roughly speaking, after the projection to the singlet state $||s\rangle\rangle$, the $-R/4$ curvature term in the spinor sector $\mathcal{S}$ is canceled by an opposite amount $+R/4$ in the transposed spinor sector $\mathcal{S}^T$. So we have to conclude for the second part, that the above group–theoretical procedure yields *no* relation between the even operator (1.0.3) that acts on scalar functions, and the square of the Dirac operator (1.0.2), despite the fact that they both contain the same $-R/4$ term!

The third part develops the antisymplectic side. It is spurred by the following questions.

1. Do there exist antisymplectic Clifford algebras and spinors?
2. Does there exist a natural spinor generalization $\Delta^{(\sigma)}$ of the odd Δ operator (1.0.1), which takes antisymplectic spinors to antisymplectic spinors?
3. Can the odd $\Delta^{(\sigma)}$ operator from question 2 be written as a square

$$\Delta^{(\sigma)} \stackrel{?}{=} D^{(\sigma)} \star D^{(\sigma)} \quad (\text{antisymplectic}) \quad (1.0.6)$$

of an antisymplectic Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma)} = \gamma^A \nabla_A^{(\sigma)}$, where “ $\star$ ” is a Fermionic multiplication, $\varepsilon(\star) = 1$, and γ^A are antisymplectic γ matrices?

The answers, which will be derived in detail in Sections 4 and 7, are, by most standards, “*no*” to question 3, and “*yes, there exists a first–order formalism, but there is no second–order formalism*” to question 1 and 2. Here the first– and second–order formalism refer to the realizations of the Lie–algebras of infinitesimal frame and coordinate changes in terms of first– and second–order differential operators, respectively. The obstacle in eq. (1.0.6) lies in the definition of the $\star$ multiplication. We shall, however, introduce a Fermionic nilpotent parameter θ that can be thought of as the inverse $\star^{-1}$, but since such θ parameter by definition is not invertible, the $\star$ multiplication itself becomes meaningless. The trick is therefore, roughly speaking, to multiply both side of eq. (1.0.6) with $\theta \equiv \star^{-1}$, cf. Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 7.1.

At the coarsest level, the main text is organized into $3 \times 2 = 6$ sections. The three Sections 2–4 are devoted to general (=not necessarily spin) manifolds, while the next three Sections 5–7 deal exclusively with spin manifolds. Sections 3 and 6 consider the Riemannian case, and Sections 4 and 7 consider the antisymplectic case, while Sections 2 and 5 consider the general theory that is common for both Riemannian and antisymplectic case. The general theory Sections 2 and 5 explain differential geometry, such as, connections, torsion tensors, vielbeins, flat and curved exterior forms, etc., in the context of supermanifolds, where sign factors are important. The Riemannian curvature tensor, the Ricci tensor and the scalar curvature are considered in Subsections 2.4–2.6, 3.7–3.8 and 4.6–4.7. Finally, Section 8 has our conclusions.

1.1 General Remarks About Notation

Adjectives from supermathematics such as “graded”, “super”, etc., are implicitly implied. The sign conventions are such that two exterior forms ξ and η , of Grassmann–parity $\varepsilon_\xi, \varepsilon_\eta$ and of form–degree p_ξ, p_η , commute in the following graded sense:

$$\eta \wedge \xi = (-1)^{\varepsilon_\xi \varepsilon_\eta + p_\xi p_\eta} \xi \wedge \eta \equiv (-1)^{\vec{\varepsilon}_\xi \cdot \vec{\varepsilon}_\eta} \xi \wedge \eta \quad (1.1.1)$$

inside the exterior algebra. The pair (ε, p) acts as a 2–dimensional vector–valued Grassmann–parity

$$\vec{\varepsilon} := \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \\ p \pmod{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.1.2)$$

Table 1: The $2 \times 2 = 4$ classical geometries and their symmetries [18]. Only even Riemannian and antisymplectic geometries have non-trivial Laplacians, scalar curvatures and Weitzenböck-type identities.

	Even Geometry	Odd Geometry
Riemannian Covariant Metric	$g = Y^A g_{AB} \vee Y^B$ $\varepsilon(g_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B$ $g_{BA} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} g_{AB}$ Symmetric No Closeness Relation	$g = Y^A g_{AB} \vee Y^B$ $\varepsilon(g_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1$ $g_{BA} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} g_{AB}$ Symmetric No Closeness Relation
Inverse Riemannian Contravariant Metric	$\varepsilon(g^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B$ $g^{BA} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} g^{AB}$ Symmetric Even Laplacian	$\varepsilon(g^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1$ $g^{BA} = (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} g^{AB}$ Skewsymmetric No Laplacian
Symplectic Covariant Two-Form	$\omega = \frac{1}{2} C^A \omega_{AB} \wedge C^B$ $\varepsilon(\omega_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B$ $\omega_{BA} = (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} \omega_{AB}$ Skewsymmetric Closeness Relation	$E = \frac{1}{2} C^A E_{AB} \wedge C^B$ $\varepsilon(E_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1$ $E_{BA} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} E_{AB}$ Skewsymmetric Closeness Relation
Inverse Symplectic Contravariant Tensor	$\varepsilon(\omega^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B$ $\omega^{BA} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \omega^{AB}$ Skewsymmetric No Laplacian	$\varepsilon(E^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1$ $E^{BA} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} E^{AB}$ Symmetric Odd Laplacian

as indicated in the second equality of eq. (1.1.1). The first component carries ordinary Grassmann-parity ε , while the second component carries form-parity, *i.e.*, form degree modulo two. The exterior wedge symbol “ $\wedge$ ” is often not written explicitly, as it is redundant information that can be deduced from the Grassmann- and form-parity. The commutator $[F, G]$ and anticommutator $\{F, G\}_+$ of two operators F and G are

$$[F, G] := FG - (-1)^{\varepsilon_F \varepsilon_G + p_F p_G} GF \equiv FG - (-1)^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_F \tilde{\varepsilon}_G} GF, \quad (1.1.3)$$

$$\{F, G\}_+ := FG + (-1)^{\varepsilon_F \varepsilon_G + p_F p_G} GF \equiv FG + (-1)^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_F \tilde{\varepsilon}_G} GF. \quad (1.1.4)$$

The commutator (1.1.3) fulfills the Jacobi identity

$$\sum_{\text{cycl. } F, G, H} (-1)^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_F \tilde{\varepsilon}_H} [F, [G, H]] = 0. \quad (1.1.5)$$

The transposed of a product of operators is:

$$(FG)^T = (-1)^{\varepsilon_F \varepsilon_G + p_F p_G} G^T F^T \equiv (-1)^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_F \tilde{\varepsilon}_G} G^T F^T. \quad (1.1.6)$$

Covariant and exterior derivatives will always be from the left, while partial derivatives can be from either left or right. We shall sometimes use round parenthesis “ $()$ ” to indicate how far derivatives act, see *e.g.*, eqs. (2.3.3), (3.3.2), (3.4.2) and (3.4.3) below.

2 General Theory

2.1 Connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)} = d + \Gamma$

Let there be given a manifold M with local coordinates z^A of Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(z^A) = \varepsilon_A$ (and form-degree $p(z^A) = 0$). Assume that M is endowed with a measure density ρ . Let $\Gamma(TM)$ denote the set of sections in the tangent bundle TM , *i.e.*, the set of vector fields on M . Let M be endowed with a tangent bundle connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)} = d + \Gamma = dz^A \otimes \nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} : \Gamma(TM) \times \Gamma(TM) \rightarrow \Gamma(TM)$

$$\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \partial_B^r \Gamma_{AC}^B \overrightarrow{dz}^C . \quad (2.1.1)$$

Here $\partial_A^r \equiv (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \partial_A^\ell$ are not usual partial derivatives. In particular, they do not act on the Christoffel symbols Γ_{AC}^B in eq. (2.1.1). Rather they are a dual basis to the one-forms $\overrightarrow{dz}^A$:

$$\overrightarrow{dz}^A (\partial_B^r) = \delta_B^A , \quad \varepsilon(\overrightarrow{dz}^A) = \varepsilon_A = \varepsilon(\partial_A^r) . \quad (2.1.2)$$

Phrased differently, the ∂_A^r are merely bookkeeping devices, that transform as right partial derivatives under general coordinate transformations. (To be able to distinguish them from true partial derivatives, the differentiation variable z^A on a true partial derivative $\partial/\partial z^A$ is written explicitly.) For fixed index “ A ” in eq. (2.1.1), the Christoffel symbol Γ_{AC}^B is a matrix with respect to index “ B ” and index “ C ”, and $\partial_B^r \Gamma_{AC}^B \overrightarrow{dz}^C$ is the corresponding linear operator: $TM \rightarrow TM$. (We shall often refer to a linear operator by its matrix, and vice-versa.)

The form-parities $p(\overrightarrow{dz}^A) = p(\partial_A^r)$ are either all 0 or all 1, depending on applications, whereas a 1-form dz^A with no arrow “ $\rightarrow$ ” always carries odd form-parity $p(dz^A) = 1$ (and Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(dz^A) = \varepsilon_A$).

2.2 Torsion

The torsion tensor $T^{(\Gamma)} : \Gamma(TM) \times \Gamma(TM) \rightarrow \Gamma(TM)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(\Gamma)} &\equiv \frac{1}{2} dz^A \wedge \partial_B^r T^{(\Gamma)B}_{AC} dz^C := [\nabla^{(\Gamma)} \wedge \text{Id}] \\ &= [dz^A \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + dz^A \partial_B^r \Gamma_{AD}^B \overrightarrow{dz}^D \wedge \partial_C^r dz^C] = dz^A \wedge \partial_B^r \Gamma_{AC}^B dz^C . \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.1)$$

where it is implicitly understood that there are no contractions with base manifold indices, in this case index “ A ” and index “ C ”. As expected, the torsion tensor is just an antisymmetrization of the Christoffel symbol Γ_{AC}^B with respect to the lower indices,

$$T^{(\Gamma)A}_{BC} := \Gamma_{BC}^A + (-1)^{(\varepsilon_B+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)} (B \leftrightarrow C) . \quad (2.2.2)$$

In particular, the Christoffel symbol

$$\Gamma_{BC}^A = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_B+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)} (B \leftrightarrow C) \quad (2.2.3)$$

is symmetric with respect to the lower indices when the connection is torsionfree.

2.3 Divergence

A connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ can be used to define a divergence of a Bosonic vector field X^A as

$$\text{str}(\nabla^{(\Gamma)} X) \equiv (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} (\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} X)^A = ((-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \Gamma^B_{BA}) X^A, \quad \varepsilon_X = 0. \quad (2.3.1)$$

On the other hand, the divergence is defined in terms of ρ as

$$\text{div}_\rho X := \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} (\rho X^A). \quad (2.3.2)$$

See Ref. [24] for a mathematical exposition of divergence operators on supermanifolds. The $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ connection is called compatible with the measure density ρ if

$$\Gamma^B_{BA} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \ln \rho \right). \quad (2.3.3)$$

In this case, the two definitions (2.3.1) and (2.3.2) of divergence agree, cf. Ref. [4].

2.4 The Riemann Curvature

We discuss in this Subsection 2.4 the Riemann curvature tensor on a supermanifold [25]. See Ref. [12] and Ref. [26] for related discussions. The Riemann curvature $R^{(\Gamma)}$ is defined as (half) the commutator of the $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ connection (2.1.1),

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(\Gamma)} &= \frac{1}{2} [\nabla^{(\Gamma)} \wedge \nabla^{(\Gamma)}] = -\frac{1}{2} dz^B \wedge dz^A \otimes [\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)}, \nabla_B^{(\Gamma)}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} dz^B \wedge dz^A \otimes \partial_D^r R^D_{ABC} \overrightarrow{dz}^C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4.1)$$

where it is implicitly understood that there are no contractions with base manifold indices, in this case index “A” and index “B”. (For a torsionfree connection such contractions vanish, and there is no ambiguity.)

$$\begin{aligned} R^D_{ABC} &= \overrightarrow{dz}^D \left([\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)}, \nabla_B^{(\Gamma)}] \partial_C^r \right) \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_D \varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \Gamma^D_{BC} \right) + \Gamma^D_{AE} \Gamma^E_{BC} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4.2)$$

Note that the order of indices in the Riemann curvature tensor R^D_{ABC} is non-standard. This is to minimize appearances of Grassmann sign factors. Alternatively, the Riemann curvature tensor may be defined as

$$R(X, Y)Z = \left([\nabla_X^{(\Gamma)}, \nabla_Y^{(\Gamma)}] - \nabla_{[X, Y]}^{(\Gamma)} \right) Z = Y^B X^A R_{AB}^D{}_C Z^C \partial_D^\ell, \quad (2.4.3)$$

where $X = X^A \partial_A^\ell$, $Y = Y^B \partial_B^\ell$ and $Z = Z^C \partial_C^\ell$ are left vector field of even Grassmann- and form-parity. The Riemann curvature tensor $R_{AB}^D{}_C$ reads in local coordinates

$$R_{AB}^D{}_C = (-1)^{\varepsilon_D (\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B)} R^D_{ABC} = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \Gamma^D_{BC} \right) + (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_D} \Gamma^D_{AE} \Gamma^E_{BC} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B). \quad (2.4.4)$$

Here we have introduced a reordered Christoffel symbol

$$\Gamma_A^B{}^C := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{AC}^B . \quad (2.4.5)$$

It is sometimes useful to reorder the indices in the Riemann curvature tensors as

$$R_{ABC}{}^D = ([\nabla_A, \nabla_B] \partial_C^\ell)^D = (-1)^{\varepsilon_C(\varepsilon_D+1)} R_{AB}{}^D{}_C . \quad (2.4.6)$$

Note that all expressions (2.4.2), (2.4.4) and (2.4.6) of Riemann curvature tensor are antisymmetric under an $(A \leftrightarrow B)$ exchange of index “A” and “B”. The first Bianchi identity reads (in the torsionfree case):

$$0 = \sum_{\text{cycl. } A,B,C} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} R_{ABC}{}^D . \quad (2.4.7)$$

We have exceptionally used the convention $p(\partial_A^\ell)=0$ in eqs. (2.4.3) and (2.4.6).

2.5 The Ricci Tensor

The Ricci tensor is defined as

$$R_{AB} := R^C{}_{CAB} . \quad (2.5.1)$$

The Ricci tensor becomes symmetric

$$\begin{aligned} R_{AB} &= \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_C}}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} (\rho \Gamma^C{}_{AB}) - \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \ln \rho \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^B} \right) - \Gamma_A{}^D{}_C \Gamma^C{}_{DB} \\ &= -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.5.2)$$

when the $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ connection is torsionfree $T^{(\Gamma)}=0$ and ρ -compatible (2.3.3).

2.6 The Ricci Two-Form

The Ricci two-form is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{AB} := R_{AB}{}^C{}_C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \quad (2.6.1)$$

The Ricci two-form vanishes

$$\mathcal{R}_{AB} = 0 , \quad (2.6.2)$$

when the $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ connection is torsionfree $T^{(\Gamma)}=0$ and ρ -compatible (2.3.3).

2.7 Covariant Tensors

Let

$$\Omega_{mn}(M) := \Gamma \left(\bigwedge^m (T^*M) \otimes \bigvee^n (T^*M) \right) \quad (2.7.1)$$

be the vector space of $(0, m+n)$ -tensors $\eta_{A_1 \dots A_m B_1 \dots B_n}(z)$ that are antisymmetric with respect to the first m indices $A_1 \dots A_m$, and symmetric with respect to the last n indices $B_1 \dots B_n$. As usual, it is practical to introduce a coordinate-free notation

$$\eta(z; C; Y) = \frac{1}{m!n!} C^{A_m} \wedge \dots \wedge C^{A_1} \eta_{A_1 \dots A_m B_1 \dots B_n}(z) \otimes Y^{B_n} \vee \dots \vee Y^{B_1} . \quad (2.7.2)$$

Here the variables Y^A are symmetric counterparts to the one-form basis $C^A \equiv dz^A$.

$$\begin{aligned} C^A \wedge C^B &= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} C^B \wedge C^A, & \varepsilon(C^A) &= \varepsilon_A, & p(C^A) &= 1, \\ Y^A \vee Y^B &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} Y^B \vee Y^A, & \varepsilon(Y^A) &= \varepsilon_A, & p(Y^A) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7.3)$$

The covariant derivative can be realized on covariant tensors $\eta \in \Omega_{mn}(M)$ by a linear differential operator

$$\nabla_A^{(T)} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \Gamma_A{}^B{}_C T^C{}_B, \quad (2.7.4)$$

where

$$T^A{}_B := C^A \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^B} + Y^A \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial Y^B} \quad (2.7.5)$$

are themselves linear differential operators. They are generators of the general linear ($= gl$) Lie-algebra,

$$[T^A{}_B, T^C{}_D] = \delta_B^C T^A{}_D - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B)(\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D)} \delta_D^A T^C{}_B. \quad (2.7.6)$$

It is important for the implementation (2.7.4) to make sense that η carries no explicit indices, *i.e.*, all indices should be paired as indicated in eq. (2.7.2). The Lie-algebra (2.7.6) reflects infinitesimal coordinate transformation, *i.e.*, diffeomorphism invariance.

2.8 Coordinate Transformations

Consider for simplicity a one-form $\eta = \eta_A(z) C^A \in \Omega_{10}(M)$. The covariant derivative reads

$$(\nabla_A \eta)_C = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \eta_C \right) - \eta_B \Gamma^B{}_{AC}. \quad (2.8.1)$$

Under a coordinate transformation $z^A \rightarrow z'^A$ one has

$$\eta_A = \eta'_B (z'^B \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A}), \quad (2.8.2)$$

$$C'^A = (z'^A \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^B}) C^B = C^B \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} z'^A \right), \quad (2.8.3)$$

$$(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (z'^B \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^D}) \Gamma^D{}_{AC} = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} z'^B \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^C} \right) + \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} z'^D \right) \Gamma'^D{}_{E}{}^B (z'^E \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^C}), \quad (2.8.4)$$

so that the covariant derivative transforms covariantly,

$$(\nabla_A \eta)_D = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} z'^B \right) (\nabla'_B \eta')_C (z'^C \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^D}). \quad (2.8.5)$$

3 Riemannian Geometry

3.1 Metric

Let there be given a (pseudo) Riemannian metric, *i.e.*, a covariant symmetric $(0, 2)$ tensor field

$$g = Y^A g_{AB} \vee Y^B \in \Omega_{02}(M), \quad (3.1.1)$$

of Grassmann-parity

$$\varepsilon(g_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B, \quad \varepsilon(g) = 0, \quad p(g_{AB}) = 0, \quad (3.1.2)$$

and of symmetry

$$g_{BA} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} g_{AB}. \quad (3.1.3)$$

We shall not need nor discuss positivity/reality/Hermiticity-conditions in this paper (except for the application to a particle in a curved space, cf. Subsection 3.10). The symmetry (3.1.3) becomes more transparent if one reorders the Riemannian metric as

$$g = Y^B \vee Y^A \tilde{g}_{AB}, \quad (3.1.4)$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_{AB} := g_{AB}(-1)^{\varepsilon_B}. \quad (3.1.5)$$

Then the symmetry (3.1.3) simply reads

$$\tilde{g}_{BA} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \tilde{g}_{AB}. \quad (3.1.6)$$

The Riemannian metric g_{AB} is assumed to be non-degenerate, *i.e.*, there exists an inverse contravariant symmetric $(2,0)$ tensor field g^{AB} such that

$$g_{AB} g^{BC} = \delta_A^C. \quad (3.1.7)$$

The inverse g^{AB} has Grassmann-parity

$$\varepsilon(g^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B, \quad (3.1.8)$$

and symmetry

$$g^{BA} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} g^{AB}. \quad (3.1.9)$$

The canonical density on a Riemannian manifold is

$$\rho_g := \sqrt{g} := \sqrt{\text{sdet}(g_{AB})}. \quad (3.1.10)$$

This should be compared with the antisymplectic case, where the density ρ is kept arbitrary, since there is no canonical choice [25]. To ease comparison, we shall temporarily allow for arbitrary densities ρ in the Riemannian case as well.

3.2 Laplacian Δ_ρ

A Laplacian Δ_ρ , which takes scalar functions to scalar functions, can be constructed from the inverse metric g^{AB} and a (not necessarily canonical) density ρ ,

$$\Delta_\rho := \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho g^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B}, \quad \varepsilon(\Delta_\rho) = 0, \quad p(\Delta_\rho) = 0. \quad (3.2.1)$$

A metric bracket (f, g) of two functions $f = f(z)$ and $g = g(z)$ can be defined via a double commutator with the Laplacian, acting on the constant unit function 1,

$$\begin{aligned} (f, g) &:= \frac{1}{2} [[\overrightarrow{\Delta}_\rho, f], g] 1 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \Delta_\rho(fg) - \frac{1}{2} (\Delta_\rho f)g - \frac{1}{2} f(\Delta_\rho g) + \frac{1}{2} fg(\Delta_\rho 1) \\ &= (f \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A}) g^{AB} (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} g) = (-1)^{\varepsilon_f \varepsilon_g} (g, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2.2)$$

There are *no* closeness relations (resp. Jacobi identities) associated with the Riemannian g_{AB} metric (3.1.4) (resp. metric $(\cdot, \cdot)$ bracket (3.2.2)) in contrast to symplectic situations. In fact, even if such closeness relations and Jacobi identities were to be artificially enforced in one coordinate patch, they would not transform covariantly under general coordinate transformations $z^A \rightarrow z'^B$. See also Subsection 3.1 in Ref. [27].

3.3 Two-cocycle $\nu(\rho'; \rho, g)$

It is possible to introduce a Riemannian analogue of the two-cocycle of Khudaverdian and Voronov [18, 21, 4]. The two-cocycle $\nu(\rho'; \rho, g)$ is a function of a measure density ρ' with respect to a reference system (ρ, g) ,

$$\nu(\rho'; \rho, g) := \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\rho'}} (\Delta_\rho \sqrt{\frac{\rho'}{\rho}}) = \nu_{\rho'}^{(0)} - \nu_\rho^{(0)}, \quad (3.3.1)$$

where

$$\nu_\rho^{(0)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} (\Delta_1 \sqrt{\rho}) = -\sqrt{\rho} (\Delta_\rho \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}) = (\Delta_1 \ln \sqrt{\rho}) + (\ln \sqrt{\rho}, \ln \sqrt{\rho}). \quad (3.3.2)$$

Here Δ_1 is the Laplacian (3.2.1) with $\rho=1$. The expression (3.3.1) acts as a scalar under general coordinate transformations, and satisfies the following two-cocycle condition:

$$\nu(\rho_1; \rho_2, g) + \nu(\rho_2; \rho_3, g) + \nu(\rho_3; \rho_1, g) = 0. \quad (3.3.3)$$

In fact, it is a two-coboundary, because we shall prove in the next Subsection 3.4, that there exists a scalar ν_ρ , such that

$$\nu(\rho'; \rho, g) = \nu_{\rho'} - \nu_\rho. \quad (3.3.4)$$

3.4 Scalar ν_ρ

A Grassmann-even function ν_ρ can be constructed from the metric g and a (not necessarily canonical) density ρ as

$$\nu_\rho := \nu_\rho^{(0)} + \frac{\nu^{(1)}}{4} - \frac{\nu^{(2)}}{8} - \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{16}, \quad (3.4.1)$$

where $\nu_\rho^{(0)}$ is given by eq. (3.3.2), and

$$\nu^{(1)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^B}) (-1)^{\varepsilon_B}, \quad (3.4.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{(2)} &:= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} (z^C, (z^B, z^A)) (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g_{BC}) \\ &= -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_D+1)} (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^D} g^{AB}) g_{BC} (g^{CD} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.3)$$

$$\nu^{(3)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} (g_{AB}, g^{BA}). \quad (3.4.4)$$

Here $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the metric bracket (3.2.2).

Lemma 3.1 *The even quantity ν_ρ is a scalar, i.e., it does not depend on the coordinate system.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1: Under an arbitrary infinitesimal coordinate transformation $\delta z^A = X^A$, one calculates (by using methods similar to the antisymplectic case [22])

$$\delta \nu_\rho^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_1 \operatorname{div}_1 X, \quad (3.4.5)$$

$$\delta \nu^{(1)} = 2 \Delta_1 \operatorname{div}_1 X + (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} g^{AB}) (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} X^C), \quad (3.4.6)$$

$$\delta\nu^{(2)} = 2(-1)^{\epsilon_C} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} g^{AB} \right) \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} X^C \right) + 2(-1)^{\epsilon_A} g_{AB} \left(g^{BC}, \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} X^A \right), \quad (3.4.7)$$

$$\delta\nu^{(3)} = -4(-1)^{\epsilon_A} g_{AB} \left(g^{BC}, \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} X^A \right). \quad (3.4.8)$$

One easily sees that while the four constituents $\nu_\rho^{(0)}$, $\nu^{(1)}$, $\nu^{(2)}$ and $\nu^{(3)}$ separately have non-trivial transformation properties, the linear combination ν_ρ in eq. (3.4.1) is indeed a scalar.

□

Spurred by what happens in the antisymplectic case [4], we would like to classify which zeroth-order term ν one could add to the Laplacian (3.2.1). The following Proposition 3.2 is designed to answer this question.

Proposition 3.2 (Classification of 2-order differential invariants) *If a function $\nu = \nu(z)$ has the following properties:*

1. *The function ν is a scalar.*
2. *$\nu(z)$ is a polynomial of the metric $g_{AB}(z)$, the density $\rho(z)$, their inverses, and z -derivatives thereof in the point z .*
3. *ν is invariant under constant rescaling of the density $\rho \rightarrow \lambda\rho$, where λ is a z -independent parameter.*
4. *ν scales as $\nu \rightarrow \lambda\nu$ under constant Weyl scaling $g^{AB} \rightarrow \lambda g^{AB}$, where λ is a z -independent parameter.*
5. *Each term in ν contains precisely two z -derivatives.*

Then ν is of the form

$$\nu = \alpha \nu_\rho + \beta \nu_{\rho_g} + \gamma \left(\ln \frac{\rho}{\rho_g}, \ln \frac{\rho}{\rho_g} \right), \quad (3.4.9)$$

where α , β and γ are three arbitrary z -independent parameters.

Remarks: Conditions 1–5 are imposed, because the Laplacian (3.2.1) has these properties. Note that if one collects the ρ -dependence into a function of $\ln \rho$ and its z -derivatives, the conditions 2 and 3 both exclude undifferentiated $\ln \rho$ -dependence (because $\ln \rho$ is not a finite polynomial in ρ and ρ^{-1} , and because $\ln \rho \rightarrow \ln \rho + \ln \lambda$ is not invariant, respectively). So scalars like $\nu_\rho \ln(\rho/\rho_g)$ are excluded from our considerations.

SKETCHED PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2: The first idea of the proof is to replace condition 1 with a weaker condition

- 1'. *The function ν is invariant under affine coordinate transformations $z^A \rightarrow z'^B = \Lambda^B_A z^A + \lambda^B$.*

Secondly, recall that every polynomial is a finite linear combinations of monomials. One can argue that if $\nu(z)$ is a polynomial that satisfy condition 1' plus conditions 2–5 of Proposition 3.2, then each of its constituent monomials (that contributes nontrivially) must by themselves satisfy condition 1' plus conditions 2–5. Thus one can limit the search (for a linear basis) to monomials. It follows from

lengthy but straightforward combinatorial arguments that a basis for the polynomials ν that satisfy condition 1' plus conditions 2–5 is:

$$\nu_\rho^{(0)}, \nu_{\rho_g}^{(0)}, \nu^{(1)}, \nu^{(2)}, \nu^{(3)}, \nu^{(4)}, \nu_\rho^{(5)}, \nu_{\rho_g}^{(5)}, \nu_\rho^{(6)}, \nu_{\rho_g}^{(6)}, \nu_\rho^{(7)}, \quad (3.4.10)$$

where $\nu_\rho^{(0)}, \nu^{(1)}, \nu^{(2)}, \nu^{(3)}$ were defined above, and

$$\nu^{(4)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \right) g_{BC} (g^{CD} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^D}) (-1)^{\varepsilon_D}, \quad (3.4.11)$$

$$\nu_\rho^{(5)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \right) \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \ln \rho \right), \quad (3.4.12)$$

$$\nu_\rho^{(6)} := (\ln \rho, \ln \rho), \quad (3.4.13)$$

$$\nu_\rho^{(7)} := (\ln \rho, \ln \rho_g). \quad (3.4.14)$$

Thirdly, under an arbitrary infinitesimal coordinate transformation $\delta z^A = X^A$, one calculates

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \nu^{(4)} &= 2(-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \right) \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \operatorname{div}_1 X \right) \\ &\quad + 2g^{AB} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} X^C \right) g_{CD} (g^{DE} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^E}) (-1)^{\varepsilon_E}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \nu_\rho^{(5)} &= (\ln \rho, \operatorname{div}_1 X) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \right) \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \operatorname{div}_1 X \right) \\ &\quad + g^{AB} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} X^C \right) \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} \ln \rho \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.16)$$

$$\delta \nu_\rho^{(6)} = -2(\ln \rho, \operatorname{div}_1 X), \quad (3.4.17)$$

$$\delta \nu_\rho^{(7)} = -(\ln(\rho_g \rho), \operatorname{div}_1 X). \quad (3.4.18)$$

It is easy to check that the only linear combinations of the basis elements (3.4.10) that satisfy condition 1, are given by formula (3.4.9).

□

3.5 Δ And Δ_g

The Riemannian analogue Δ_g of Khudaverdian's Δ_E operator [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] is defined as

$$\Delta_g := \Delta_1 + \frac{\nu^{(1)}}{4} - \frac{\nu^{(2)}}{8} - \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{16}. \quad (3.5.1)$$

We will prove below that the Δ_g operator (3.5.1) takes semidensities to semidensities. It is obviously manifestly independent of ρ . Next, we define a Riemannian analogue of the Grassmann–odd nilpotent Δ operator in antisymplectic geometry [4]. The even Δ operator, which takes scalar functions to scalar functions, is defined for arbitrary ρ as

$$\Delta := \Delta_\rho + \nu_\rho. \quad (3.5.2)$$

This Δ operator (3.5.2) is well-defined, because of Lemma 3.1. One may prove (by using methods similar to the antisymplectic case [22, 4]), that the two operators Δ and Δ_g are related via a similarity-transformation with $\sqrt{\rho}$,

$$\Delta_g = \sqrt{\rho} \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}. \quad (3.5.3)$$

PROOF OF EQ. (3.5.3): Let σ denote an arbitrary argument for the Δ_g operator. (The argument σ is a semidensity, but we shall not use this fact.) Then, it follows from the explicit ν_ρ formula (3.4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_g \sigma) &= (\Delta_1 \sigma) + \left(\frac{\nu^{(1)}}{4} - \frac{\nu^{(2)}}{8} - \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{16} \right) \sigma = (\Delta_1 \sigma) - (\Delta_1 \sqrt{\rho}) \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \nu_\rho \sigma \\ &= \sqrt{\rho} (\Delta_1 \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\rho}}) + 2(\sqrt{\rho}, \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\rho}}) + \nu_\rho \sigma = \sqrt{\rho} (\Delta_\rho \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\rho}}) + \nu_\rho \sigma = \sqrt{\rho} (\Delta \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\rho}}) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.4)$$

□

Eq. (3.5.3) shows that the Δ_g operator (3.5.1) takes semidensities to semidensities. The Δ operator (3.5.2) has, in turn, the remarkable property that the $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated operator $\sqrt{\rho} \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}$ is independent of ρ . This is strikingly similar to what happens in the antisymplectic case, cf. Subsection 4.4. It is interesting to investigate how unique this property is? Consider a primed operator

$$\Delta' := \Delta + \nu = \Delta_\rho + \nu_\rho + \nu , \quad (3.5.5)$$

where ν is a most general zeroth-order term. (We will in this paper not consider the possibility of changing second- and first-order parts of Laplace operators, *i.e.*, we will only consider changes to the zeroth-order term for simplicity.) It is easy to see from eqs. (3.5.3) and (3.5.5) that the corresponding $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated operator $\sqrt{\rho} \Delta' \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}$ is independent of ρ if and only if the shift term ν is ρ -independent. On the other hand, by invoking Proposition 3.2, one sees that ν is ρ -independent if and only if $\nu = \beta \nu_{\rho_g}$ is proportional to ν_{ρ_g} . So an operator of the form $\Delta' = \Delta + \beta \nu_{\rho_g}$, for arbitrary coefficient β , is the most general operator with this property. This is the minimal answer one could possibly have hoped for, since a ρ -independence argument will never be able to detect the presence of a ρ -independent shift term like $\beta \nu_{\rho_g}$.

3.6 Levi-Civita Connection

A connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ is called *metric*, if it preserves the metric g ,

$$0 = (\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} \tilde{g})_{BC} = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \tilde{g}_{BC} \right) - ((-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{BAC} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_C} (B \leftrightarrow C)) . \quad (3.6.1)$$

Here we have lowered the Christoffel symbol with the metric

$$\Gamma_{ABC} := g_{AD} \Gamma_{BC}^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} . \quad (3.6.2)$$

The metric condition (3.6.1) reads in terms of the contravariant inverse metric

$$0 = (\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} g)^{BC} \equiv \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{BC} \right) + \left(\Gamma_A^B g^{DC} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_C} (B \leftrightarrow C) \right) . \quad (3.6.3)$$

The Levi-Civita connection is the unique connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ that is both torsionfree $T^{(\Gamma)} = 0$ and metric (3.6.1). The Levi-Civita formula for the lowered Christoffel symbol in terms of derivatives of the metric reads

$$2\Gamma_{CAB} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \tilde{g}_{CB} \right) + (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_C) \varepsilon_B} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \tilde{g}_{CA} \right) - \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^C} \tilde{g}_{AB} \right) . \quad (3.6.4)$$

A density ρ is compatible (2.3.3) with the Levi-Civita Christoffel symbol (3.6.4) if and only if ρ is proportional to the canonical density (3.1.10).

3.7 The Riemann Curvature

For a metric connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$, we prefer to work with a $(0, 4)$ Riemann tensor (as opposed to a $(1, 3)$ tensor) by lowering the upper index with the metric (3.1.1). In terms of Christoffel symbols it is easiest to work with expression (2.4.2):

$$\begin{aligned} R_{D,ABC} &:= g_{DE} R^E_{ABC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_D} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \Gamma_{DBC} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_E(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_D + 1) + \varepsilon_C} \Gamma_{EAD} \Gamma^E_{BC} \right) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.7.1)$$

In the second equality of eq. (3.7.1) is used the metric condition (3.6.1). If the metric condition (3.6.1) is used one more time on the first term in eq. (3.7.1), one derives the following skewsymmetry

$$R_{D,ABC} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B)(\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D) + \varepsilon_C \varepsilon_D} (C \leftrightarrow D) . \quad (3.7.2)$$

This skewsymmetry becomes clearer if one instead starts from expression (2.4.6) and define

$$R_{AB,CD} := R_{ABC}{}^E \tilde{g}_{ED} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_D(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)} R_{D,ABC} . \quad (3.7.3)$$

Then the skewsymmetry (3.7.2) simply translates into a skewsymmetry between the third and fourth index:

$$R_{AB,CD} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_C \varepsilon_D} (C \leftrightarrow D) . \quad (3.7.4)$$

We note that the torsionfree condition has not been used so far in this Section 3.7. The first Bianchi identity (2.4.7) reads (in the torsionfree case):

$$0 = \sum_{\text{cycl. } A,B,C} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} R_{AB,CD} . \quad (3.7.5)$$

The $(A \leftrightarrow B)$ antisymmetry, the $(C \leftrightarrow D)$ antisymmetry (3.7.4) and the first Bianchi identity (3.7.5) imply that Riemann curvature tensor $R_{AB,CD}$ is symmetric with respect to an $(AB \leftrightarrow CD)$ exchange of two pairs of indices:

$$R_{AB,CD} = (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B)(\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D)} (AB \leftrightarrow CD) . \quad (3.7.6)$$

This, in turn, implies that there is a version of the first Bianchi identity (3.7.5), where one sums cyclically over the three last indices:

$$0 = \sum_{\text{cycl. } B,C,D} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_D} R_{AB,CD} . \quad (3.7.7)$$

It is interesting to compare Riemann tensors in the Riemannian case with the antisymplectic case. In both cases, the $(A \leftrightarrow B)$ antisymmetry and the Bianchi identity (3.7.5) hold, but the $(C \leftrightarrow D)$ antisymmetry (3.7.4) turns in the antisymplectic case into an $(C \leftrightarrow D)$ symmetry (4.6.4), and there is *no* antisymplectic analogue of the $(AB \leftrightarrow CD)$ exchange symmetry (3.7.6), cf. Subsection 4.6.

3.8 Scalar Curvature

The scalar curvature is defined as

$$R := (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} g^{BA} R_{AB} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} R_{AB} g^{BA} . \quad (3.8.1)$$

Proposition 3.3 *The Levi–Civita scalar curvature R is proportional to the scalar ν_{ρ_g} ,*

$$R = -4\nu_{\rho_g} . \quad (3.8.2)$$

SKETCHED PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3: Straightforward calculations shows that

$$R = -4\nu_{\rho_g}^{(0)} - \nu^{(1)} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} g^{AB} \Gamma_B^D \Gamma_C^C \Gamma_{DA}^C , \quad (3.8.3)$$

where

$$2(-1)^{\varepsilon_A} g^{AB} \Gamma_B^D \Gamma_C^C \Gamma_{DA}^C = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{BC}^A (g^{CB} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial^r}}{\partial z^A}) = \nu^{(2)} + \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{2} . \quad (3.8.4)$$

□

As a corollary of Proposition 3.3 one gets that the ν_ρ scalar (3.4.1) for arbitrary ρ is given by the formula

$$\nu_\rho = \nu(\rho; \rho_g, g) + \nu_{\rho_g} = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_g}{\rho}} (\Delta_{\rho_g} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\rho_g}}) - \frac{R}{4} . \quad (3.8.5)$$

3.9 The Δ Operator At $\rho = \rho_g$

When one restricts to $\rho = \rho_g$, the Δ operator (3.5.2) reduces to the Laplace–Beltrami operator minus a quarter of the Levi–Civita scalar curvature:

$$\Delta|_{\rho=\rho_g} = \Delta_{\rho_g} + \nu_{\rho_g} = \Delta_{\rho_g} - \frac{R}{4} . \quad (3.9.1)$$

This is the even operator (1.0.3) already mentioned in the Introduction. But the important question is: Does the zeroth–order term $\nu_{\rho_g} = -R/4$ in the operator (3.9.1) have a property that distinguish it from all the other zeroth–order terms? Yes, in the following sense:

1. Firstly, consider the most general ρ –independent operator of the form

$$\Delta_{\rho_g} + \nu , \quad (3.9.2)$$

where Δ_{ρ_g} is the Laplace–Beltrami operator and ν is a general zeroth–order term. (Here it is important that we only allow ρ –independent ν ’s from the very beginning.)

2. Secondly, apply Proposition 3.2 to classify the possible zeroth–order terms ν . In detail, one sees that $\nu = \beta \nu_{\rho_g}$ is proportional to ν_{ρ_g} for some proportionality factor β . Hence the operator (3.9.2) is actually

$$\Delta_{\rho_g} + \beta \nu_{\rho_g} . \quad (3.9.3)$$

3. Thirdly, replace the canonical density $\rho_g \rightarrow \rho$ by an arbitrary density ρ . In other words, replace the ρ –independent operator (3.9.3) with the corresponding ρ –dependent operator

$$\Delta' := \Delta_\rho + \beta \nu_\rho . \quad (3.9.4)$$

More rigorously, one should consider an algebra homomorphism $s : \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\rho,g}$ from the algebra $\mathcal{A}_g$ of differential operators, that only depend on the metric g , to the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,g}$ of differential operators, that depend on both the density ρ and the metric g . The s homomorphism

should satisfy $\pi \circ s = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}_g}$, where $\pi : \mathcal{A}_{\rho,g} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_g$ denotes the restriction map $|_{\rho=\rho_g}$ and “ $\circ$ ” denotes composition. Clearly such a procedure is in general highly ambiguous, but in the present situation, where we are only interested in the ρ -extension of just two operators, namely the second-order operator Δ_{ρ_g} and the zeroth-order operator ν_{ρ_g} , there is a preferred candidate for the s homomorphism in this sector, *i.e.*, $\Delta_{\rho_g} \xrightarrow{s} \Delta_\rho$ and $\nu_{\rho_g} \xrightarrow{s} \nu_\rho$, respectively.

4. Fourthly, apply the $\sqrt{\rho}$ -independence argument of Subsection 3.5. It follows that the $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated Δ' operator $\sqrt{\rho}\Delta'\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}$ becomes independent of ρ if and only if $\beta=1$. (In the antisymplectic case Δ' is also nilpotent if and only if $\beta=1$.) Thus we conclude that the coefficient $\beta=1$, and hence the even Δ operator (3.5.2) is singled out.
5. Fifthly, restrict to $\rho = \rho_g$. Hence one arrives at the preferred operator (3.9.1).

Needless to say, that the above argument depends crucially on the order of the above five steps. In particular, if step 3 is performed before step 1 and 2, *i.e.*, if one considers the most general ρ -dependent zeroth-order term ν from the very beginning, the β coefficient in front of the zeroth-order term ν_{ρ_g} would remain arbitrary.

3.10 Particle In Curved Space

In this Subsection 3.10 we indicate how the Δ operator (3.5.2) is related to quantization of a particle in a curved Riemannian target space [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] with a measure density ρ not necessarily equal to the canonical density (3.1.10). The classical Hamiltonian action S_{cl} is

$$S_{\text{cl}} = \int dt \left(p_A \dot{z}^A - H_{\text{cl}} \right), \quad H_{\text{cl}} = \frac{1}{2} p_A p_B g^{BA} + V, \quad \{z^A, p_B\}_{PB} = \delta_B^A, \quad (3.10.1)$$

where p_A denote the momenta for the z^A variables. We shall for simplicity not consider reparametrizations of the time variable t . Moreover, we assume that the Riemannian metric $g_{AB} = g_{AB}(z)$, the density $\rho = \rho(z)$, the potential $V = V(z)$ and general coordinate transformations $z^A \rightarrow z'^B = f^B(z)$ do not depend explicitly on time t . The naive Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}_\rho$ is [7, 9, 10, 11]

$$\hat{H}_\rho - V(\hat{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{p}_A^r g^{AB}(\hat{z}) \hat{p}_B^\ell = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}} \hat{p}_A \rho(\hat{z}) g^{AB}(\hat{z}) \hat{p}_B \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_B}}{\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}} \quad (3.10.2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} [\hat{p}_A + \frac{\hbar}{i} \ln \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})} \overleftarrow{\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}^A}}] g^{AB}(\hat{z}) [\hat{p}_B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} - \frac{\hbar}{i} \overrightarrow{\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}^B}} \ln \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}] \quad (3.10.3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \hat{p}_A g^{AB}(\hat{z}) \hat{p}_B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \nu_\rho^{(0)}(\hat{z}) \quad (3.10.4)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(p_A p_B g^{BA}(z) \right)^\wedge + \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left(\nu_\rho^{(0)}(\hat{z}) + \frac{\nu^{(1)}(\hat{z})}{4} \right). \quad (3.10.5)$$

The left, middle, and right momentum operators, denoted by $\hat{p}_A^\ell$, $\hat{p}_A$, and $\hat{p}_A^r$, respectively, are related as

$$\frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}} \hat{p}_A^\ell \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})} = \hat{p}_A = \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})} \hat{p}_A^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}}. \quad (3.10.6)$$

The non-zero canonical equal-time commutator relations read

$$-[\hat{p}_B^\ell, \hat{z}^A] = [\hat{z}^A, \hat{p}_B] = [\hat{z}^A, \hat{p}_B^r] = i\hbar \delta_B^A \mathbf{1}. \quad (3.10.7)$$

The hat “ $\wedge$ ” in eq. (3.10.5) denotes the corresponding Weyl-ordered operator. We mention for completeness a temporal point-splitting operation “ T ” defined as [12]

$$T\left(\hat{F}_1(t)\cdots\hat{F}_n(t)\right) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} (-1)^{\varepsilon_{F,\pi}} \lim_{\substack{t_1, \dots, t_n \rightarrow t \\ t_{\pi(1)} > \dots > t_{\pi(n)}}} \hat{F}_{\pi(1)}(t_{\pi(1)}) \cdots \hat{F}_{\pi(n)}(t_{\pi(n)}) , \quad (3.10.8)$$

where $\varepsilon_{F,\pi}$ denotes the Grassmann sign factor arising from permuting

$$\hat{F}_1(t_1) \cdots \hat{F}_n(t_n) \longrightarrow \hat{F}_{\pi(1)}(t_{\pi(1)}) \cdots \hat{F}_{\pi(n)}(t_{\pi(n)}) . \quad (3.10.9)$$

For most practical purposes, the temporal point-splitting “ T ” is the same as Weyl ordering “ $\wedge$ ”. In particular, Weyl-ordering “ $\wedge$ ” and temporal point-splitting “ T ” yield the same two-loop quantum correction:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \left(p_A p_B g^{BA}(z) \right)^\wedge \\ & T\left(\hat{p}_A \hat{p}_B g^{BA}(\hat{z}) \right) \end{aligned} \right\} - \hat{p}_A g^{AB}(\hat{z}) \hat{p}_B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} = \frac{1}{4} [\hat{p}_A, [\hat{p}_B, g^{BA}(\hat{z})]] = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4} \nu^{(1)}(\hat{z}) . \quad (3.10.10)$$

Note that Weyl-ordering “ $\wedge$ ” and temporal point-splitting “ T ” are *not* covariant operations.

Now what should be the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ for the operator formalism? Obviously, one must (among other things) demand that

1. $\hat{H}$ is a scalar invariant.
2. $\hat{H}$ is Hermitean.
3. $\hat{H}$ has dimension of energy.
4. $\hat{H}$ reduces to the classical Hamiltonian H_{cl} in the classical limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.

The naive Hamiltonian operator (3.10.2) satisfies all these conditions 1–4. It is a scalar invariant, since the momentum operators transform by definition under coordinate transformations $z^A \rightarrow z'^B = f^B(z)$ as

$$\hat{p}_B^\ell = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial f^B(\hat{z})} \hat{z}^A \right) \hat{p}_A^\ell , \quad (3.10.11)$$

$$\hat{p}_B^r = \hat{p}_A^r \left(\hat{z}^A \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial f^B(\hat{z})} \right) , \quad (3.10.12)$$

$$\hat{p}_B' = \left(p_A \left(z^A \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial f^B(z)} \right) \right)^\wedge = \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{p}_A, \hat{z}^A \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial f^B(\hat{z})} \}_+ . \quad (3.10.13)$$

Note however that conditions 1–4 do not specify the quantum corrections to the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. For instance, one could add any multiple of $\hbar^2 \nu_\rho(\hat{z})$ to $\hat{H}$ without affecting conditions 1–4. Now recall that every choice of $\hat{H}$ in the operator formalism corresponds to a choice of action functional in the path integral. One may fix the ambiguity by additionally demanding the following:

5. The operator formalism with the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}$ should correspond to a Hamiltonian path integral formulation where the path integral action is the pure classical action S_{cl} with no quantum corrections, i.e.,

$$\langle z_f | \exp \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{H} \Delta t \right] | z_i \rangle = \langle z_f, t_f | z_i, t_i \rangle \sim \int_{z(t_i)=z_i}^{z(t_f)=z_f} [dz][dp] \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{cl}}[z, p] \right] . \quad (3.10.14)$$

The reader may wonder why we invoke the path integral formulation. The point is that, on one hand, there is *no* unique way of telling what part of an operator should be considered as quantum corrections, while on the other hand, there is a well-defined quantum part of an action functional, namely all the terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\hbar)$. The phase space path integral in quantum mechanics does not need to be renormalized (unlike configuration space path integrals or quantum field theories), so it is consistent to demand that the bare quantum corrections of the action functional vanish. Condition 5 determines in principle the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}$ to all orders in $\hbar$, but we shall in this paper truncate $\hat{H}$ at two-loop order, *i.e.*, ignore possible higher-order quantum corrections of order $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^3)$ for simplicity. According to standard heuristic arguments, it follows from condition 5 that the quantum Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} \sim T(H_{\text{cl}}) \quad (3.10.15)$$

is equal to the time-ordered classical Hamiltonian $T(H_{\text{cl}})$. However, time-ordering “ T ” is not a geometrically well-defined operation, at least not if one uses the temporal point-splitting (3.10.8). It should only be trusted modulo terms that contains single-derivatives of the metric [12]. In detail, the time-ordered classical Hamiltonian $T(H_{\text{cl}})$ is given by the following non-covariant expression

$$T(H_{\text{cl}}) = \hat{H}_\rho - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left(\nu_\rho^{(0)}(\hat{z}) + \frac{\nu^{(1)}(\hat{z})}{4} \right), \quad (3.10.16)$$

cf. eqs. (3.10.5) and (3.10.10). The combination

$$\nu_\rho^{(0)} + \frac{\nu^{(1)}}{4} = \nu_\rho + \frac{\nu^{(2)}}{8} + \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{16} = \nu_\rho + \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{4} g^{AB} \Gamma_B^D \Gamma_C^D \Gamma^C_{DA} \quad (3.10.17)$$

is the ν_ρ scalar (3.4.1) plus non-covariant terms that contain single-derivatives of the metric, cf. eq. (3.8.3). Equations (3.10.15), (3.10.16) and (3.10.17) therefore strongly suggest that the full quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_\rho - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \nu_\rho(\hat{z}) = T(H_{\text{cl}}) - \frac{\hbar^2}{16} \left(\nu^{(2)}(\hat{z}) + \frac{\nu^{(3)}(\hat{z})}{2} \right), \quad (3.10.18)$$

where we are neglecting possible quantum corrections of order $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^3)$. The operator (3.10.18) satisfies condition 1–5. For instance, it is a scalar invariant because of Lemma 3.1. We shall provide further details concerning condition 5 in eq. (3.10.39) below. The preferred operator (3.10.18) also has an extra feature:

6. The three operators

$$\hat{H}_g = \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})} \hat{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}}, \quad \hat{H}, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})}} \hat{H} \sqrt{\rho(\hat{z})} \quad (3.10.19)$$

are independent of ρ , if one declares that the left, middle, or right momentum operators $\hat{p}_A^\ell$, $\hat{p}_A$, or $\hat{p}_A^r$ are independent of ρ , respectively.

We are now ready to relate the Δ operator (3.5.2) to a particle in a curved space. The main point is that the Hamiltonian (3.10.18) becomes $\Delta = \Delta_\rho + \nu_\rho$ from eq. (3.5.2) if we identify

$$\hat{z}^A \leftrightarrow z^A, \quad \hat{p}_A^\ell \leftrightarrow \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A}, \quad (3.10.20)$$

$$\hat{H}_\rho - \hat{V} \leftrightarrow -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_\rho, \quad \hat{H} - \hat{V} \leftrightarrow -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta, \quad \hat{H}_g - \hat{V} \leftrightarrow -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_g. \quad (3.10.21)$$

In detail, let $|z, t\rangle_\rho := |z, t\rangle / \sqrt{\rho(z)}$ denote the instantaneous eigenstate $\hat{z}^A(t)|z, t\rangle_\rho = z^A|z, t\rangle_\rho$, and let the eigenstate $|z, t\rangle$ be the corresponding semidensity state with normalization $\int d^N z |z, t\rangle\langle z, t| = \mathbf{1}$ and Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(|z, t\rangle) = 0$. As a check, note that the formula (3.10.14) is covariant since it is implicitly understood that the path integral contains one more momentum integration $\prod_{i=1}^n \int dp(t_{2i-1})$ than coordinate integration $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \int dz(t_{2i})$ for any temporal discretization

$$t_i \equiv t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{2n-1} < t_{2n} \equiv t_f . \quad (3.10.22)$$

The momentum operators $\hat{p}_A^\ell$, $\hat{p}_A$, or $\hat{p}_A^r$ act on the eigenstates as follows:

$$\rho\langle z, t|\hat{p}_A^\ell(t) = \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho\langle z, t| , \quad \langle z, t|\hat{p}_A(t) = \frac{\hbar}{i} \langle z, t|\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A} , \quad (3.10.23)$$

$$\hat{p}_A^r(t)|z, t\rangle_\rho = i\hbar|z, t\rangle_\rho \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A} , \quad \hat{p}_A(t)|z, t\rangle = i\hbar|z, t\rangle \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A} . \quad (3.10.24)$$

Therefore, the Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_\rho$, $\hat{H}$, and $\hat{H}_g$ translate into the Laplace operators Δ_ρ , Δ , and Δ_g :

$$\rho\langle z, t|(\hat{H}_\rho(t) - \hat{V}(t)) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_\rho \rho\langle z, t| , \quad (3.10.25)$$

$$\rho\langle z, t|(\hat{H}(t) - \hat{V}(t)) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta \rho\langle z, t| , \quad (3.10.26)$$

$$\langle z, t|(\hat{H}_g(t) - \hat{V}(t)) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_g \langle z, t| , \quad (3.10.27)$$

cf. eqs. (3.2.1), (3.5.2) and (3.5.3), respectively. The time-evolution of states and operators are governed by

$$\rho\langle z, t|\hat{H}(t) = i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \rho\langle z, t| , \quad \langle z, t|\hat{H}(t) = i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \langle z, t| , \quad (3.10.28)$$

$$\hat{H}(t)|z, t\rangle_\rho = \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dt} |z, t\rangle_\rho , \quad \hat{H}(t)|z, t\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dt} |z, t\rangle , \quad (3.10.29)$$

$$i\hbar \left(\frac{d}{dt} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \hat{F}(t) = [\hat{F}(t), \hat{H}(t)] , \quad (3.10.30)$$

where $\hat{F}(t) = F(\hat{z}(t), \hat{p}(t), t)$ is an arbitrary operator that may depend explicitly on time t . We should mention that semidensity states appear in geometric quantization [28].

Let us now calculate the left-hand side of eq. (3.10.14), *i.e.*, the transition element $\langle z_f | e^{-\beta \hat{H}} | z_i \rangle$ in the operator formalism using expression (3.10.18) as the Hamiltonian [13]. Here we define

$$\Delta t := t_f - t_i , \quad \beta := \frac{i}{\hbar} \Delta t , \quad \gamma := \frac{i}{\hbar \Delta t} . \quad (3.10.31)$$

It is better to change coordinates $(z_i^A; z_f^A) \rightarrow (z_m^A; \Delta z^A)$ from the start-point z_i^A and the endpoint z_f^A to the midpoint z_m^A and the displacement Δz^A , where

$$z_m^A := \frac{z_f^A + z_i^A}{2} , \quad \Delta z^A := z_f^A - z_i^A . \quad (3.10.32)$$

In fact, we will suppress the subscript “ m ” since it is implicitly understood from now on that all quantities are to be evaluated at the midpoint. We are going to rewrite all operators in terms of symbols [29]. The Weyl symbol H_W for the quantum Hamiltonian (3.10.18) reads

$$H_W := (\hat{H})_W = H_{\text{cl}} + \frac{\hbar^2}{16} \left(\nu^{(2)} + \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{2} \right) , \quad (3.10.33)$$

cf. eq. (3.10.18). Two Weyl symbols F and G are multiplied together via the Groenewold/Moyal $*$ product. It can be graphically represented as:

$$F * G = F \exp[\mapsto] G = FG + (F \mapsto G) + \frac{1}{2}(F \rightrightarrows G) + \mathcal{O}(\mapsto^3), \quad (3.10.34)$$

$$\frac{2}{i\hbar}(F \mapsto G) = (F \leftarrow G) - (F \rightarrow G) = \{F, G\}_{PB}, \quad (3.10.35)$$

$$\leftarrow := \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial^r}}{\partial z^A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial p_A}, \quad \rightarrow := \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial^r}}{\partial p_A} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial z^A}. \quad (3.10.36)$$

We will also need the zp -ordered and the pz -ordered symbols. They can be expressed in terms of the Weyl symbol $(\cdot)_W$ as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{z_f p} &= \frac{\langle z_f | \hat{F} | p \rangle}{\langle z_f | p \rangle} = \exp \left[-\frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial p_A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial z_f^A} \right] F_{W_f} \\ &= \exp \left[\left(\frac{\Delta z^A}{2} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial p_A} \right) \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial z^A} \right] F_W, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_{p z_i} &= \frac{\langle p | \hat{F} | z_i \rangle}{\langle p | z_i \rangle} = \exp \left[\frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial p_A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial z_i^A} \right] F_{W_i} \\ &= \exp \left[\left(\frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial p_A} - \frac{\Delta z^A}{2} \right) \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^\ell}}{\partial z^A} \right] F_W. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10.38)$$

The transition element (or propagator) in the operator formalism now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_f | e^{-\beta \hat{H}} | z_i \rangle &= \int d^N p \langle z_f | e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}} | p \rangle \langle p | e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}} | z_i \rangle = \int d^N p \langle z_f | p \rangle \langle p | z_i \rangle (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}})_{z_f p} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}})_{p z_i} \\ &= \int \frac{d^N p}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} p_A \Delta z^A} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}})_W * (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \hat{H}})_W = \int \frac{d^N p}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} p_A \Delta z^A} (e^{-\beta \hat{H}})_W \\ &= \int \frac{d^N p}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} p_A \Delta z^A} e^{-\beta H_W} \\ &\quad \times \left(1 + \frac{\beta^2}{4} (H_W \rightrightarrows H_W) + \frac{\beta^3}{6} (H_W \mapsto H_W \mapsto H_W) + \mathcal{O}(\mapsto^4) \right) \\ &= (2\pi i \hbar \Delta t)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \rho_g e^{\frac{1}{2}\gamma \Delta z^A g_{AB} \Delta z^B} e^{-\beta V} \left(1 - \frac{\hbar^2 \beta}{16} \left(\nu^{(2)} + \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{\hbar^2 \beta^2}{8} \left((H_{\text{cl}} \leftrightsquigarrow H_{\text{cl}}) - (H_{\text{cl}} \rightrightarrows H_{\text{cl}}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\hbar^2 \beta^3}{24} \left((H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}} \leftarrow H_{\text{cl}}) + (H_{\text{cl}} \leftarrow H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}}) - 2(H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \mathcal{O}(\rightarrow^4, \hbar^3) \right) \right) \Big|_{p=\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial^r}}{\partial \Delta z}} \\ &= (2\pi i \hbar \Delta t)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \rho_g \left(e^{-\beta V} \left(1 - \frac{\hbar^2 \beta}{24} R \right) + \frac{\hbar^2 \beta}{6} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta V} (\Delta_{\rho_g} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta V}) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2, \hbar^3) \right) \\ &= (2\pi i \hbar \Delta t)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \rho e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta V} \left(1 + \frac{\hbar^2 \beta}{6} \overrightarrow{\Delta} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2, \hbar^3) \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta V} \Big|_{\rho=\rho_g}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10.39)$$

In the first equality of eq. (3.10.39) we summed over a complete set of momentum states $|p\rangle$, so that it becomes possible to replace operators by symbols. The zp -ordered and the pz -ordered symbols (3.10.37) and (3.10.38) were used in the second and third equality. We performed integration by part of p_A in the third equality. In the sixth equality, we replaced all non-Gaussian appearances of the momenta p_A by derivatives with respect to the displacement Δz^A , and performed the p_A integration. After the integration over p_A , the terms downstairs in the seventh expression (that are either quadratic or cubic in H_{cl}) read

$$(H_{\text{cl}} \rightrightarrows H_{\text{cl}}) \sim \frac{1}{\beta} \nu^{(2)} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2), \quad (3.10.40)$$

$$(H_{\text{cl}} \rightrightarrows H_{\text{cl}}) \sim g^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \left(V - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln g \right) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \nu^{(3)} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2), \quad (3.10.41)$$

$$(H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}}) \sim \frac{1}{\beta^2} \nu^{(2)} + \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\beta} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g^{AB} \right) \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \left(V - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln g \right) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2), \quad (3.10.42)$$

$$(H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}} \leftarrow H_{\text{cl}}) \sim \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left(\nu^{(1)} - \frac{\nu^{(3)}}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{\beta} g^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \left(V - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln g \right) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2), \quad (3.10.43)$$

$$(H_{\text{cl}} \leftarrow H_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow H_{\text{cl}}) \sim \left(V - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln g, V - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln g \right) - \frac{1}{2\beta^2} \nu^{(3)} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta z)^2). \quad (3.10.44)$$

All the individual contributions of eqs. (3.10.40)–(3.10.44) have been collected in the eighth and ninth expression of eq. (3.10.39). The eighth expression is the well-known covariant formula for the path integral, *i.e.*, the right-hand side of eq. (3.10.14). In the phase space path integral, the $R/24$ term arises from the integration over quantum fluctuations [12]. In the ninth (and last) expression of eq. (3.10.39), the $R/24$ term conspires with the Beltrami–Laplace operator to produce yet another appearance of the Δ operator (3.5.2).

3.11 First-Order S^{AB} Matrices

After considering quantization of a particle on a curved space in Subsection 3.10, we shall continue with the investigation of Riemannian manifolds. We will assume for the remainder of the Riemannian Sections 3 and 6 that the density $\rho = \rho_g$ is equal to the canonical density (3.1.10).

Because of the presence of the metric tensor g^{AB} , the symmetry of the general linear ($= gl$) Lie-algebra (2.7.6) reduces to an orthogonal Lie-subalgebra. Its generators $S_{\mp}^{AB}$ read

$$S_{\mp}^{AB} := C^A g^{BC} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^C} + Y^A g^{BC} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial Y^C} \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B), \quad (3.11.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(S_{\mp}^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B, \quad p(S_{\mp}^{AB}) = 0, \quad (3.11.2)$$

$$S_{\mp C}^A := S_{\mp}^{AB} g_{BC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C}. \quad (3.11.3)$$

The $S_{\mp}^{AB}$ matrices are called first-order matrices, because they are first-order differential operators in the C^A and Y^A variables. The $S_{\mp}^{AB}$ matrices satisfy an orthogonal Lie-algebra:

$$[S_{\mp}^{AB}, S_{\mp}^{CD}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)} \left(g^{BC} S_{\mp}^{AD} + S_{\mp}^{BC} g^{AD} \right) \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B), \quad (3.11.4)$$

$$[S_{\mp}^{AB}, S_{\pm}^{CD}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)} \left(g^{BC} S_{\pm}^{AD} - S_{\pm}^{BC} g^{AD} \right) \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B). \quad (3.11.5)$$

Note that the eqs. (3.11.4) and (3.11.5) remain invariant under a c -number shift

$$S_+^{AB} \rightarrow S_+^{\prime AB} := S_+^{AB} + \alpha g^{AB} \mathbf{1} , \quad (3.11.6)$$

where α is a parameter.

3.12 Γ^A Matrices

The standard Dirac operator is only defined on a spin manifold, it depends on the vielbein, and we shall describe it in Subsections 6.4–6.6. But first we shall introduce a poor man's version of Γ^A matrices and the so-called Hodge–Dirac operator in the next Subsections 3.12–3.15. This construction will work for a general Riemannian manifold, which is not necessarily a spin manifold.

The Γ^A matrices can be defined via a Berezin–Fradkin operator representation [30, 31]

$$\Gamma_\lambda^A \equiv \Gamma^A := C^A + \lambda P^A , \quad P^A := g^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^B} , \quad (3.12.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(\Gamma^A) = \varepsilon_A , \quad p(\Gamma^A) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (3.12.2)$$

where λ is a Bosonic parameter with $\varepsilon(\lambda)=0=p(\lambda)$, which is introduced to bring our presentation of the Riemannian case in closer analogy with the antisymplectic case, see Subsection 4.9. One may interpret λ as a Planck constant. The Γ^A matrices satisfy a Clifford algebra

$$[\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B] = 2\lambda g^{AB} \mathbf{1} . \quad (3.12.3)$$

The Γ^A matrices form a fundamental representation of the an orthogonal Lie–algebra (3.11.4):

$$[S_\mp^{AB}, \Gamma^C] = \Gamma_{\pm\lambda}^A g^{BC} \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \quad (3.12.4)$$

If one commutes a metric connection $\nabla_A^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) with a Γ^B matrix, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(T)}, \Gamma^B] = -\Gamma_A^B \Gamma^C . \quad (3.12.5)$$

The minus sign on the right-hand side of eq. (3.12.5) can be explained as follows: The contravariant flat Γ^A matrices are passive bookkeeping devices that ultimately should be contracted with an active covariant tensor field η_A . It is this implicitly written η_A that we are really differentiating. Thus there should be a minus sign.

The $\nabla_A^{(T)}$ realization (2.7.4) can be identically rewritten into the following $S_\pm$ matrix realization

$$\nabla_A^{(S)} := \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_\pm \Gamma_{A,BC}^\pm S_\pm^{CB} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} , \quad (3.12.6)$$

i.e., $\nabla_A^{(T)} = \nabla_A^{(S)}$, where

$$\Gamma_{A,BC}^\pm (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} := \frac{1}{2} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{BAC} \pm (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_C} (B \leftrightarrow C) . \quad (3.12.7)$$

The Levi–Civita $\Gamma_{A,BC}^\pm$ connection reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{A,BC}^+ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g_{BC} \right) , \\ \Gamma_{A,BC}^- &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{g}_{AB} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^C} \right) + (-1)^{(\varepsilon_B+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)} (B \leftrightarrow C) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.12.8)$$

Note that both the S_-^{AB} and the S_+^{AB} matrices are needed in the matrix realization (3.12.6).

3.13 C Versus Y

The S^{AB} matrices (3.11.1) treat the C^A and the Y^A variables on complete equal footing, whereas the Γ^A matrices (6.4.1) contain only the C 's. Just from demanding that the Γ^A matrices carry definite Grassmann- and form-parity, such $C \leftrightarrow Y$ symmetry breaking seems unavoidable. Further analysis of the Riemannian case reveals that it is only possible to write a Berezin–Fradkin operator representation (6.4.1) of the Clifford algebra (6.4.3) using the C^A variables. (The C^A variables are also preferred in the antisymplectic case as well, see Subsection 4.B below.) One may ponder if there are situations where the Y variables are useful instead? Yes. The democracy between C and Y gets restored in a bigger framework that allows for both even and odd, Riemannian and symplectic manifolds, cf. Table 1. For instance, the Y^A variables are the only ones suitable for writing down a Berezin–Fradkin-like representation

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^A := Y^A + \lambda \omega^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial Y^B}, \quad \varepsilon(\tilde{\Gamma}^A) = \varepsilon_A, \quad p(\tilde{\Gamma}^A) = 0, \quad (3.13.1)$$

of the Heisenberg algebra

$$[\tilde{\Gamma}^A, \tilde{\Gamma}^B] = 2\lambda \omega^{AB} \mathbf{1} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) \quad (3.13.2)$$

in even symplectic geometry [32, 33, 34]. (The Y^A variables are also preferred in the odd Riemannian case [25, 35, 36].)

Returning to the even Riemannian case, we will for simplicity only consider the C^A variables from now on, *i.e.*, we shall from now on put the Y^A variables to zero $Y^A \rightarrow 0$ everywhere, in particular inside the T^A_B matrices (2.7.5) and the S^{AB} matrices (3.11.1).

3.14 Hodge $*$ Operation

One may formally define a Hodge $*$ operation on exterior forms $\eta = \eta(z; C) \in \Omega_{\bullet 0}(M)$ as a fiberwise Fourier transformation

$$(*\eta)(z; C) := \int \frac{d^N C'}{\rho} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} C' \wedge C} \eta(z; C'), \quad (3.14.1)$$

where we have introduced the shorthand notation

$$C' \wedge C := C'^A g_{AB} \wedge C^B. \quad (3.14.2)$$

The Hodge $*$ operation is an involution $*^2 \sim \text{Id}$. Note that the Hodge dual $*\eta$ in general is a distribution.

In detail, the Hodge $*$ operation is built out of two operations: Firstly, a fiberwise Fourier transform

$$\Gamma \left(\bigwedge^\bullet (T^*M) \right) \equiv \Omega_{\bullet 0}(M) \ni \eta \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} \pi = \mathcal{F}\eta \in \Gamma \left(\bigwedge^\bullet (TM) \right), \quad (3.14.3)$$

that takes exterior forms $\eta = \eta(z; C)$ to multivectors

$$\pi = \pi(z; B) = \frac{1}{m!} \pi^{A_1 \dots A_m}(z) B_{A_m}^\ell \wedge \dots \wedge B_{A_1}^\ell, \quad (3.14.4)$$

where $B_A^\ell \equiv (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} B_A^r$ and

$$B_A^\ell \wedge B_C^\ell = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} B_C^\ell \wedge B_A^\ell, \quad \varepsilon(B_A^\ell) = \varepsilon_A, \quad p(B_A^\ell) = 1. \quad (3.14.5)$$

The Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}$ itself only depends on the density ρ :

$$(\mathcal{F}\eta)(z; B) := \int \frac{d^N C}{\rho} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} C^A \wedge B_A^\ell} \eta(z; C) . \quad (3.14.6)$$

Secondly, a flat map

$$\Gamma(TM) \ni X \xrightarrow{\flat} \eta = X^\flat \in \Gamma(T^*M) , \quad (3.14.7)$$

that takes vectors $X = X^A B_A^\ell$ to co-vectors $\eta = \eta_A C^A$. The Riemannian flat map $\flat$ is $X_A^\flat = X^B g_{BA}$, or equivalently, in terms of basis elements,

$$B_A^\ell = g_{AB} C^B . \quad (3.14.8)$$

Altogether, the Hodge $*$ operation can be written as

$$(*\eta)(z; C) = (\mathcal{F}\eta)(z; B) \Big|_{B_A^\ell = g_{AB} C^B} . \quad (3.14.9)$$

In contrast to the Riemannian case, there is no good way to construct an antisymplectic Hodge $*$ operation. This is because the antisymplectic flat map $B_A^\ell = E_{AB} C^B$ carries the opposite Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(B_A^\ell) = \varepsilon_A + 1$, cf. Subsection 4.1.

Proposition 3.4 *The Hodge adjoint de Rham operator, also known as the Hodge codifferential, is:*

$$\begin{aligned} *d* &\sim \delta := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho - \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g_{BC} \right) C^C P^B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \right) P^A \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g_{BC} \right) S_+^{CB} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \right) P^A . \end{aligned} \quad (3.14.10)$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.4:

$$\begin{aligned} (*d*\eta)(z, C) &= \int \frac{d^N C'}{\rho} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} C' \wedge C} C'^A \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \int \frac{d^N C''}{\rho} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} C'' \wedge C'} \eta(z, C'') \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \int \frac{d^N C'}{\rho} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} C \wedge C' \right) \right) \int \frac{d^N C''}{\rho} C'^A e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} (C'' - C) \wedge C'} \eta(z, C'') \\ &= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{d^N C''}{\rho} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} C \wedge P \right) \right) \int \frac{d^N C'}{\rho} P^A e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} (C'' - C) \wedge C'} \eta(z, C'') \\ &\sim \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} C \wedge P \right) \right) \rho P^A \eta(z, C) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.14.11)$$

□

3.15 Hodge–Dirac Operator $D^{(T)} = d + \lambda\delta$

We shall for the remainder of Section 3 assume that the connection is the Levi–Civita connection.

Central for our discussion are the T^A_B generators (2.7.5). They act on exterior forms $\eta \in \Omega_{\bullet 0}(M)$, i.e., functions $\eta = \eta(z; C)$ of z and C . (Recall that the Y^A variables are put to zero $Y^A \rightarrow 0$.)

The Dirac operator $D^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) is a Γ^A matrix (3.12.1) times the covariant derivative (2.7.4)

$$D^{(T)} := \Gamma^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = C^A \nabla_A^{(T)} + \lambda P^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = d + \lambda\delta, \quad (3.15.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(D^{(T)}) = 0, \quad p(D^{(T)}) = 1 \pmod{2}. \quad (3.15.2)$$

The component of the Dirac operator to zeroth order in λ ,

$$D^{(T)}|_{\lambda=0} = C^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = C^A \left(\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \Gamma^B_{AC} C^C \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^B} \right) = C^A \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} = d, \quad (3.15.3)$$

is just the exterior de Rham derivative d , because the connection is torsionfree. The component of the Dirac operator to first order in λ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial \lambda}, D^{(T)} \right] &= P^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = [P^A, \nabla_A^{(T)}] + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A^{(T)} P^A \\ &= \Gamma^A_{AC} P^C + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C} \Gamma_{BAC} C^C P^B \right) P^A \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{1}{\rho_g} \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho_g - \left(\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} g_{BC} \right) C^C P^B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \right) P^A \stackrel{(3.14.10)}{=} \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15.4)$$

is the Hodge adjoint de Rham operator. Equations (3.15.3) and (3.15.4) prove the last equality in eq. (3.15.1).

The Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)} &:= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(T)} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A^{(T)} g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(T)} + \Gamma^A_{AC} g^{CB} \nabla_B^{(T)} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho_g} \nabla_A^{(T)} \rho_g g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15.5)$$

Theorem 3.5 (Weitzenböck’s formula for exterior forms) *The difference between the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(T)}$ and the Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) is*

$$D^{(T)} D^{(T)} - \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)} = -\frac{\lambda}{4} S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} \quad (3.15.6)$$

$$= -\lambda C^A R_{AB} P^B + \frac{\lambda}{2} C^B C^A R_{AB,CD} P^D P^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D}. \quad (3.15.7)$$

Remarks: The square $D^{(T)} D^{(T)} = \lambda(d\delta + \delta d)$ is known as the form Laplacian. The Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)}$ is equal to the Bochner Laplacian.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5: The square is a sum of three terms

$$D^{(T)}D^{(T)} = \frac{1}{2}[D^{(T)}, D^{(T)}] = I + II + III. \quad (3.15.8)$$

The first term is

$$I := \frac{1}{2}[\Gamma^B, \Gamma^A]\nabla_A^{(T)}\nabla_B^{(T)} = \lambda g^{BA} \nabla_A^{(T)}\nabla_B^{(T)}. \quad (3.15.9)$$

The second term is

$$\begin{aligned} II &:= \Gamma^A[\nabla_A^{(T)}, \Gamma^B]\nabla_B^{(T)} \stackrel{(3.12.5)}{=} -\Gamma^A \Gamma_A^B \Gamma_C^C \nabla_B^{(T)} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \Gamma_{CA}^B \Gamma^A \Gamma^C \nabla_B^{(T)} \\ &= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \lambda \Gamma_{CA}^B g^{AC} \nabla_B^{(T)} = \lambda \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho_g} \left(\frac{\partial^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho_g g^{AB} \right) \nabla_B^{(T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15.10)$$

Together, the first two terms $I + II$ form the Laplace operator (3.15.5):

$$I + II = \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(T)}. \quad (3.15.11)$$

The third term yields the curvature terms:

$$\begin{aligned} III &:= -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A[\nabla_A^{(T)}, \nabla_B^{(T)}] = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A R_{AB}{}^D{}_C T^C{}_D = -\frac{1}{4}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A R_{AB,CD} S_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}\left(C^B C^A + \lambda(S_-^{BA} + g^{BA}) + \lambda^2 P^B P^A\right) R_{AB,CD} S_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}C^B C^A R_{AB,CD} C^C P^D (-1)^{(\varepsilon_C+1)(\varepsilon_D+1)} - \frac{\lambda}{4}S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}P^B P^A R_{AB,CD} P^C C^D (-1)^{(\varepsilon_C+1)(\varepsilon_D+1)} \\ &= -\frac{\lambda}{4}S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} = -\lambda C^B P^A R_{AB,CD} C^D P^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -\lambda C^B R_{BA,CD} g^{DA} P^C (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)+\varepsilon_D} + \lambda C^B R_{BA,DC} C^D P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A+(\varepsilon_C+1)(\varepsilon_D+1)} \\ &= -\lambda C^B R_{BAC}{}^A P^C (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)} + \lambda C^D C^B R_{BA,DC} P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_D+1)+\varepsilon_C} \\ &= -\lambda C^B R_{BC} P^C + \frac{\lambda}{2}C^B C^D R_{DB,AC} P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A+\varepsilon_C}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15.12)$$

Here the first Bianchi identity (3.7.5) was used to cancel terms proportional to zeroth and second order in λ .

□

3.A Appendix: Is There A Second-Order Formalism?

For the standard Dirac operator, which will be discussed in Subsections 6.4–6.6, it is natural to replace the first-order s_-^{ab} matrices (6.3.1) with the second-order σ_-^{ab} matrices (6.6.1). Therefore, it is natural to speculate if it is possible to replace the first-order $S_\pm^{AB}$ matrices (3.11.1) with the following second-order matrices:

$$\Sigma_\mp^{AB} := \frac{1}{4\lambda}\Gamma^A\Gamma^B \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A\varepsilon_B}(A \leftrightarrow B), \quad (3.A.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(\Sigma_\mp^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B, \quad p(\Sigma_\mp^{AB}) = 0. \quad (3.A.2)$$

(The names first- and second-order refer to the number of C^A -derivatives.) On one hand, the matrices

$$\Sigma_-^{AB} = \frac{1}{4\lambda}\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\}_+ = \frac{1}{2\lambda}C^A C^B + \frac{1}{2}S_-^{AB} + \frac{\lambda}{2}P^A P^B. \quad (3.A.3)$$

yield precisely the same non-Abelian Lie-algebra (3.11.4) and fundamental representation (3.12.4) as the S_-^{AB} matrices. Moreover, the S_-^{AB} matrices rotate the Σ_-^{AB} matrices

$$[\Sigma_-^{AB}, S_-^{CD}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)} \left(g^{BC} \Sigma_-^{AD} + \Sigma_-^{BC} g^{AD} \right) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \quad (3.A.4)$$

However, the commutator of Σ_-^{AB} and S_+^{CD} does not close,

$$[\Sigma_-^{AB}, S_+^{CD}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)} \left(g^{BC} \tilde{\Sigma}^{AD} - \tilde{\Sigma}^{BC} g^{AD} \right) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \quad (3.A.5)$$

where the tilde generators

$$\tilde{\Sigma}^{AB} := -\frac{1}{2\lambda} C^A C^B + \frac{1}{2} S_+^{AB} + \frac{\lambda}{2} P^A P^B \quad (3.A.6)$$

have no $(A \leftrightarrow B)$ symmetry or antisymmetry. On the other hand, the matrices

$$\Sigma_+^{AB} := \frac{1}{4\lambda} [\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B] \stackrel{(3.12.3)}{=} \frac{1}{2} g^{AB} \mathbf{1} \quad (3.A.7)$$

are proportional to the identity operator, and thus behave very differently from the non-Abelian S_+^{AB} matrices.

The problem with a substitution $S_{\mp}^{AB} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mp}^{AB}$ is that the S_+^{AB} matrices appear in the matrix realization (3.12.6). On one hand, the Σ_-^{AB} representation (3.A.1) is not suitable, because it couples pathologically to the non-vanishing S_+^{AB} sector, and, on the other hand, the Σ_+^{AB} matrices are Abelian, and therefore pathological by themselves. Hence, it is doubtful if the substitution $S_{\mp}^{AB} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mp}^{AB}$ makes any sense at all. In any case, we shall dismiss the second-order $\Sigma_{\mp}^{AB}$ matrices (3.A.1) from now on.

4 Antisymplectic Geometry

4.1 Metric

Let there be given an antisymplectic metric, *i.e.*, a closed two-form

$$E = \frac{1}{2} C^A E_{AB} \wedge C^B = -\frac{1}{2} E_{AB} C^B \wedge C^A \in \Omega_{20}(M) , \quad (4.1.1)$$

of Grassmann-parity

$$\varepsilon(E_{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1 , \quad \varepsilon(E) = 1 , \quad p(E_{AB}) = 0 , \quad (4.1.2)$$

and with antisymmetry

$$E_{BA} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} E_{AB} . \quad (4.1.3)$$

The closeness condition

$$dE = 0 \quad (4.1.4)$$

reads in components

$$\sum_{\text{cycl. } A, B, C} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} E_{BC} \right) = 0 . \quad (4.1.5)$$

The antisymplectic metric E_{AB} is assumed to be non-degenerate, *i.e.*, there exists an inverse contravariant $(2, 0)$ tensor field E^{AB} such that

$$E_{AB} E^{BC} = \delta_A^C . \quad (4.1.6)$$

The inverse E^{AB} has Grassmann-parity

$$\varepsilon(E^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1, \quad (4.1.7)$$

and symmetry

$$E^{BA} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} E^{AB}. \quad (4.1.8)$$

The closeness condition (4.1.4) has no Riemannian analogue. It is the integrability condition for the local existence of Darboux coordinates.

4.2 Odd Laplacian Δ_ρ

The odd Laplacian Δ_ρ , which takes scalar functions in scalar functions, is defined as

$$2\Delta_\rho := \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho E^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B}, \quad \varepsilon(\Delta_\rho) = 1, \quad p(\Delta_\rho) = 0. \quad (4.2.1)$$

Note the factor of 2 in the odd Laplacian (4.2.1) as compared with the Riemannian case (3.2.1). It is similar in nature to the factor of 2 in difference between eqs. (3.1.1) and (4.1.1). Both are introduced to avoid factors of 2 in Darboux coordinates.

The antibracket (f, g) of two functions $f = f(z)$ and $g = g(z)$ can be defined via a double commutator with the odd Laplacian, acting on the constant unit function 1,

$$\begin{aligned} (f, g) &:= (-1)^{\varepsilon_f} [[\overrightarrow{\Delta}_\rho, f], g] 1 \equiv (-1)^{\varepsilon_f} \Delta_\rho(fg) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_f} (\Delta_\rho f)g - f(\Delta_\rho g) + (-1)^{\varepsilon_g} fg(\Delta_\rho 1) \\ &= (f \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A}) E^{AB} (\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^B} g) = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_f+1)(\varepsilon_g+1)} (g, f). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.2)$$

The antibracket (4.2.2) satisfies a Jacobi identity,

$$\sum_{\text{cycl. } f, g, h} (-1)^{(\varepsilon_f+1)(\varepsilon_h+1)} (f, (g, h)) = 0, \quad (4.2.3)$$

because of the closeness condition (4.1.4).

4.3 Odd Scalar ν_ρ

A Grassmann-odd function ν_ρ can be constructed from the antisymplectic metric E and an arbitrary density ρ as

$$\nu_\rho := \nu_\rho^{(0)} + \frac{\nu_\rho^{(1)}}{8} - \frac{\nu_\rho^{(2)}}{24}, \quad (4.3.1)$$

where

$$\nu_\rho^{(0)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} (\Delta_1 \sqrt{\rho}), \quad (4.3.2)$$

$$\nu_\rho^{(1)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} E^{AB} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^B} \right) (-1)^{\varepsilon_B}, \quad (4.3.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\rho^{(2)} &:= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} E_{BC} \right) (z^C, (z^B, z^A)) \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_D} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^D} E^{AB} \right) E_{BC} (E^{CD} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}^r}{\partial z^A}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.4)$$

Here Δ_1 is the odd Laplacian (4.2.1) with $\rho = 1$, and $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the antibracket (4.2.2).

Lemma 4.1 *The odd quantity ν_ρ is a scalar, i.e., it does not depend on the coordinate system.*

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is given in Ref. [22]. Below follows an antisymplectic version of Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 4.2 (Classification of 2-order differential invariants) *If a function $\nu = \nu(z)$ has the following properties:*

1. *The function ν is a scalar.*
2. *$\nu(z)$ is a polynomial of the metric $E_{AB}(z)$, the density $\rho(z)$, their inverses, and z -derivatives thereof in the point z .*
3. *ν is invariant under constant rescaling of the density $\rho \rightarrow \lambda\rho$, where λ is a z -independent parameter.*
4. *ν scales as $\nu \rightarrow \lambda\nu$ under constant Weyl scaling $E^{AB} \rightarrow \lambda E^{AB}$, where λ is a z -independent parameter.*
5. *Each term in ν contains precisely two z -derivatives.*

Then ν is proportional to the odd scalar ν_ρ

$$\nu = \alpha \nu_\rho , \quad (4.3.5)$$

where α is z -independent proportionality constant.

The proof of Proposition 4.2 is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.2.

4.4 Δ And Δ_E

Khudaverdian's Δ_E operator [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23], which takes semidensities to semidensities, is defined using arbitrary coordinates as

$$\Delta_E := \Delta_1 + \frac{\nu^{(1)}}{8} - \frac{\nu^{(2)}}{24} . \quad (4.4.1)$$

It is obviously manifestly independent of ρ . That it takes semidensities to semidensities will become clear because of eq. (4.4.3) below. The Jacobi identity (4.2.3) precisely encodes the nilpotency of Δ_E . The Grassmann-odd nilpotent Δ operator, which takes scalar functions to scalar functions, can be defined as defined as

$$\Delta := \Delta_\rho + \nu_\rho . \quad (4.4.2)$$

In fact, every Grassmann-odd, nilpotent, second-order operator is of the form (4.4.2) up to a Grassmann-odd constant [4]. We shall dismiss Grassmann-odd constants since they do not satisfy all the five assumptions of Proposition 4.2. The Δ_E operator and the Δ operator are related via $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugation [22, 4]

$$\Delta_E = \sqrt{\rho} \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} . \quad (4.4.3)$$

The proof is almost identical to the corresponding Riemannian calculation (3.5.4).

Recall how the zeroth-order term is determined in the Riemannian case, where no nilpotency principle was available, cf. Subsections 3.5 and 3.9. There we applied a ρ independence test. Could one do a similar analysis in the antisymplectic case? Yes. In detail, consider an operator

$$\Delta' := \Delta + \nu = \Delta_\rho + \nu_\rho + \nu, \quad (4.4.4)$$

where ν is a most general zeroth-order term. It is easy to see from eqs. (4.4.3) and (4.4.4) that the corresponding $\sqrt{\rho}$ -conjugated operator $\sqrt{\rho}\Delta'\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}$ is independent of ρ if and only if the shift term ν is ρ -independent. From Proposition 4.2, one then concludes that $\nu = 0$ has to be zero, *i.e.*, the form of the Δ operator (4.4.2) can be uniquely reproduced from a ρ -independence test and knowledge about possible scalar structures.

4.5 Antisymplectic Connection

A connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ is called *antisymplectic*, if it preserves the antisymplectic metric E ,

$$0 = (\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} E)_{BC} = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} E_{BC} \right) - ((-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{BAC} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_B \varepsilon_C} (B \leftrightarrow C)) . \quad (4.5.1)$$

Here we have lowered the Christoffel symbol with the metric

$$\Gamma_{ABC} := E_{AD} \Gamma^D_{BC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} . \quad (4.5.2)$$

We should stress that there is not a unique choice of an antisymplectic, torsionfree, and ρ -compatible connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$, *i.e.*, a connection that satisfies eqs. (4.5.1), (2.2.3) and (2.3.3). On the other hand, it can be demonstrated that such connections $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ exist locally for $N > 2$, where $N = \dim(M)$ denotes the dimension of the manifold M . (There are counterexamples for $N=2$ where $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ need not exist.) The mere existence of an antisymplectic and torsionfree connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ implies that the two-form E is closed (4.1.4), if we hadn't already assumed it in the first place. (Curiously, while it is impossible to impose closeness relations in Riemannian geometry, the closeness relations are almost impossible to avoid in geometric structures defined by two-forms.) The antisymplectic condition (4.5.1) reads in terms of the contravariant (inverse) metric

$$0 = (\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} E)^{BC} \equiv \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} E^{BC} \right) + \left(\Gamma_A^B \Gamma^C_D E^{DC} - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_B+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)} (B \leftrightarrow C) \right) . \quad (4.5.3)$$

4.6 The Riemann Curvature

For an antisymplectic connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$, we prefer to work with a $(0, 4)$ Riemann tensor (as opposed to a $(1, 3)$ tensor) by lowering the upper index with the metric (4.1.1). In terms of Christoffel symbols it is easiest to work with expression (2.4.2):

$$\begin{aligned} R_{D,ABC} &:= E_{DF} R^F_{ABC} \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_D+1)} \left((-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \Gamma_{DBC} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_F(\varepsilon_A+\varepsilon_D)} \Gamma_{FAD} \Gamma^F_{BC} \right) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \end{aligned} \quad (4.6.1)$$

In the second equality of eq. (4.6.1) is used the antisymplectic condition (4.5.1). If the antisymplectic condition (4.5.1) is used one more time on the first term in eq. (4.6.1), one derives the following symmetry

$$R_{D,ABC} = (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+\varepsilon_B)(\varepsilon_C+\varepsilon_D)+\varepsilon_C \varepsilon_D} (C \leftrightarrow D) . \quad (4.6.2)$$

This symmetry becomes clearer if one instead starts from expression (2.4.6) and defines

$$R_{AB,CD} := R_{ABC}{}^F E_{FD} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + (\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C)\varepsilon_D} R_{D,ABC} . \quad (4.6.3)$$

Then the symmetry (4.6.2) simply translates into a symmetry between the third and fourth index:

$$R_{AB,CD} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_C \varepsilon_D} (C \leftrightarrow D) . \quad (4.6.4)$$

The Ricci 2-form is then

$$\mathcal{R}_{AB} =: R_{AB}{}^C{}_C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} = R_{AB,CD} E^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} . \quad (4.6.5)$$

We note that the torsionfree condition has not been used so far in this Section 4.6. The first Bianchi identity (2.4.7) reads (in the torsionfree case):

$$0 = \sum_{\text{cycl. } A,B,C} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_C} R_{AB,CD} . \quad (4.6.6)$$

4.7 Odd Scalar Curvature

The odd scalar curvature is defined as

$$R := E^{BA} R_{AB} = R_{AB} E^{BA} . \quad (4.7.1)$$

Proposition 4.3 *For an arbitrary, antisymplectic, torsionfree, and ρ -compatible connections ∇^Γ , the scalar curvature R does only depend on E and ρ through the odd ν_ρ scalar [4]*

$$R = -8\nu_\rho . \quad (4.7.2)$$

The proof of Proposition 4.3 is given in Ref. [4]. It is extended to degenerate anti-Poisson structures in Ref. [23, 37]. In particular, one concludes that the odd scalar curvature R does not depend on the connection used, and the odd Δ operator (4.4.2) reduces to the odd Δ operator (1.0.1) in the Introduction.

Altogether, we have now established a link between the zeroth-order terms in the even and odd Δ operators (1.0.3) and (1.0.1):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Riemannian zeroth order term} & & \text{Antisymplectic zeroth order term} \\ -\frac{R}{4} = \nu_{\rho_g} & \longleftrightarrow & 2\nu_\rho = -\frac{R}{4} . \end{array} \quad (4.7.3)$$

The left (resp. right) equality is due to Proposition 3.3 (resp. 4.3). Both zeroth-order terms are characterized by the same ρ -independence test described in Subsections 3.9 and 4.4 (up to a subtlety on how to switch back and forth between ρ -dependent and ρ -independent formalism in the Riemannian case). It is no coincidence that the same coefficient minus-a-quarter appears on both sides of the correspondence (after the odd Δ operator has been multiplied with an appropriate factor 2). At the mathematical level, this is basically because the zeroth-order terms are determined by the $\nu_\rho^{(0)}$ building blocks alone, where the inverse metrics g^{AB} and E^{AB} enter in a similar manner, and only linearly. For expressions that do not depend on the metric tensors g_{AB} and E_{AB} , and only have an linear dependence of the inverse metrics g^{AB} and E^{AB} , respectively, one does not see the effects that distinguish Riemannian and antisymplectic geometry, such as *e.g.*, opposite Grassmann-parity, closeness relations and the Jacobi identities.

4.8 First-Order S^{AB} Matrices

Because of the presence of the antisymplectic tensor E^{AB} , the symmetry of the general linear ($= gl$) Lie-algebra (2.7.6) reduces to an antisymplectic Lie-subalgebra. Its generators $S_{\pm}^{AB}$ read

$$S_{\pm}^{AB} := C^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} P^B \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \quad P^A := E^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^B} , \quad (4.8.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(S_{\pm}^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1 , \quad p(S_{\pm}^{AB}) = 0 , \quad (4.8.2)$$

$$S_{\pm C}^A := S_{\pm}^{AB} E_{BC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} . \quad (4.8.3)$$

The S_{+}^{AB} matrices satisfy an antisymplectic Lie-algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} [S_{\pm}^{AB}, S_{\pm}^{CD}] &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C+1)+\varepsilon_B} \left(E^{BC} S_{+}^{AD} - S_{+}^{BC} E^{AD} \right) \\ &\mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.8.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [S_{\pm}^{AB}, S_{\mp}^{CD}] &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C+1)+\varepsilon_B} \left(E^{BC} S_{-}^{AD} + S_{-}^{BC} E^{AD} \right) \\ &\mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \end{aligned} \quad (4.8.5)$$

Note that the eqs. (4.8.4) and (4.8.5) remain invariant under a c -number shift

$$S_{+}^{AB} \rightarrow S_{+}^{\prime AB} := S_{+}^{AB} + \alpha E^{AB} \mathbf{1} , \quad (4.8.6)$$

where α is a parameter.

4.9 Γ^A Matrices

Guided by the analysis of Appendix 4.B, we now define antisymplectic Γ^A matrices via the following Berezin–Fradkin operator representation [30, 31]

$$\Gamma_{\theta}^A \equiv \Gamma^A := C^A + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \theta P^A = C^A - P^A \theta , \quad \varepsilon(\Gamma^A) = \varepsilon_A , \quad p(\Gamma^A) = 1 \pmod{2} , \quad (4.9.1)$$

where θ is a nilpotent Fermionic parameter with $\varepsilon(\theta)=1$ and $p(\theta)=0$. The Γ^A matrices satisfy a Clifford-like algebra

$$[\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B] = 2(-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \theta E^{AB} \mathbf{1} . \quad (4.9.2)$$

The Γ^A matrices form a fundamental representation of the antisymplectic Lie-algebra (4.8.4):

$$[S_{\pm}^{AB}, \Gamma^C] = \Gamma_{\pm\theta}^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} E^{BC} \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \quad (4.9.3)$$

If one commutes an antisymplectic connection $\nabla_A^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) with a Γ^B matrix, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(T)}, \Gamma^B] = -\Gamma_A^B \Gamma^C . \quad (4.9.4)$$

4.10 Dirac Operator $D^{(T)} = d + \theta\delta$

We shall for the remainder of Section 4 assume that the connection is antisymplectic, torsionfree and ρ -compatible.

The Dirac operator $D^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) is a Γ^A matrix (4.9.1) times the covariant derivative (2.7.4)

$$D^{(T)} := \Gamma^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = d + \theta\delta, \quad \varepsilon(D^{(T)}) = 0, \quad p(D^{(T)}) = 1 \pmod{2}. \quad (4.10.1)$$

Unlike the Riemannian case of Subsection 3.15, the component δ of the Dirac operator to first order in θ does not have an interpretation as a Hodge codifferential, since there is no antisymplectic Hodge $*$ operation. Even worse, it depends explicitly on the Christoffel symbols:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &:= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} P^A \nabla_A^{(T)} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} [P^A, \nabla_A^{(T)}] + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A^{(T)} P^A \\ &= \Gamma^A_{AC} P^C + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \Gamma_{BAC} C^C P^B \right) P^A \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho + \Gamma_{ABC} C^C P^B \right) P^A. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10.2)$$

Nevertheless, there exists a close antisymplectic analogue of Weitzenböck's formula (3.15.7), cf. eq. (4.10.5) below. The odd Laplacian $\Delta_\rho^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation (2.7.4) is

$$2\Delta_\rho^{(T)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A E^{AB} \nabla_B^{(T)} = \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \nabla_A^{(T)} \rho E^{AB} \nabla_B^{(T)}. \quad (4.10.3)$$

Theorem 4.4 (Antisymplectic Weitzenböck type formula for exterior forms) *The difference between the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(T)}$ and twice the odd Laplacian $\Delta_\rho^{(T)}$ in the T^A_B representation is*

$$D^{(T)} D^{(T)} - 2\theta \Delta_\rho^{(T)} = \frac{\theta}{4} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C} S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_+^{DC} \quad (4.10.4)$$

$$= -\theta C^A R_{AB} P^B + \frac{\theta}{2} C^B C^A R_{AB,CD} P^D P^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C}. \quad (4.10.5)$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.4: The square is a sum of three terms

$$D^{(T)} D^{(T)} = \frac{1}{2} [D^{(T)}, D^{(T)}] = I + II + III. \quad (4.10.6)$$

The first term is

$$I := \frac{1}{2} [\Gamma^B, \Gamma^A] \nabla_A^{(T)} \nabla_B^{(T)} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \theta E^{BA} \nabla_A^{(T)} \nabla_B^{(T)}. \quad (4.10.7)$$

The second term is

$$\begin{aligned} II &:= \Gamma^A [\nabla_A^{(T)}, \Gamma^B] \nabla_B^{(T)} \stackrel{(4.9.4)}{=} -\Gamma^A \Gamma^B_{AC} \Gamma^C \nabla_B^{(T)} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \Gamma^B_{CA} \Gamma^A \Gamma^C \nabla_B^{(T)} \\ &= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_B} \theta \Gamma^B_{CA} E^{AC} \nabla_B^{(T)} = \theta \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \left(\frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \rho E^{AB} \right) \nabla_B^{(T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10.8)$$

Together, the first two terms $I + II$ form the odd Laplacian (4.10.3):

$$I + II = 2\theta\Delta_\rho^{(T)}. \quad (4.10.9)$$

The third term yields the curvature terms:

$$\begin{aligned} III &:= -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A[\nabla_A^{(T)}, \nabla_B^{(T)}] = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A R_{AB}{}^D{}_C T^C D = \frac{1}{4}\Gamma^B\Gamma^A R_{AB,CD} S_+^{DC}(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\left(C^B C^A + (-1)^{\varepsilon_B}\theta(S_-^{BA} + E^{BA})\right) R_{AB,CD} S_+^{DC}(-1)^{\varepsilon_C} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}C^B C^A R_{AB,CD} C^C P^D(-1)^{\varepsilon_C\varepsilon_D} + \frac{\theta}{4}(-1)^{\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C} S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_+^{DC} \\ &= \frac{\theta}{4}(-1)^{\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C} S_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} S_+^{DC} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A+\varepsilon_B}\theta C^B P^A R_{AB,CD} C^D P^C \\ &= -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)}\theta C^B R_{BA,CD} E^{DA} P^C - \theta C^B R_{BA,DC} C^D P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A+\varepsilon_C\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_C+1)}\theta C^B R_{BAC}{}^A P^C + \theta C^D C^B R_{BA,DC} P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_D+1)} \\ &= -\theta C^B R_{BC} P^C + \frac{\theta}{2}C^B C^D R_{DB,AC} P^C P^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_A}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10.10)$$

Here the first Bianchi identity (4.6.6) was used one time in the θ -independent sector.

□

4.A Appendix: Is There A Second-Order Formalism?

There are no deformations of the first-order S_-^{AB} matrices (4.8.1). The general second-order deformation of the S_+^{AB} matrices (4.8.1) reads

$$\Sigma_+^{AB} := S_+^{AB} + \alpha E^{AB} \mathbf{1} + \beta P^A P^B \theta, \quad (4.A.1)$$

where α and β are two parameters. The second-order Σ_+^{AB} matrices satisfy precisely the same antisymplectic Lie-algebra (4.8.4) as the S_+^{AB} matrices. Moreover, the S_+^{AB} matrices rotate the Σ_+^{AB} matrices,

$$[\Sigma_+^{AB}, S_+^{CD}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C+1)+\varepsilon_B} \left(E^{BC} \Sigma_+^{AD} - \Sigma_+^{BC} E^{AD} \right) - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B). \quad (4.A.2)$$

The Σ_+^{AB} matrices interact with the Γ^C and the S_-^{CD} matrices as follows

$$[\Sigma_+^{AB}, \Gamma^C] = \Gamma_{(1+\beta)\theta}^A (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} E^{BC} - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B), \quad (4.A.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [\Sigma_+^{AB}, S_-^{CD}] &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A(\varepsilon_B+\varepsilon_C+1)+\varepsilon_B} \left(E^{BC} \tilde{\Sigma}^{AD} + \tilde{\Sigma}^{BC} E^{AD} \right) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B), \end{aligned} \quad (4.A.4)$$

where the generators

$$\tilde{\Sigma}^{AB} := S_-^{AB} + \beta P^A P^B \theta \quad (4.A.5)$$

have no $(A \leftrightarrow B)$ symmetry or antisymmetry. According to eq. (4.A.3), one must choose the parameter $\beta = 0$ to be zero, in order to ensure that the Σ_+^{AB} matrices rotates the Γ^A matrices in the correct way. One concludes that a consistent antisymplectic second-order formulation does not exist, regardless of whether the pathological S_-^{AB} sector decouples or not, and we shall abandon the subject. See also comment in the Conclusions.

4.B Appendix: What Is An Antisymplectic Clifford Algebra?

In this Appendix 4.B, we shall motivate the definition (4.9.2) of an antisymplectic Clifford algebra given in Subsection 4.9. Intuitively, one would probably assume that an antisymplectic Clifford algebra should be

$$\Gamma^A \star \Gamma^B - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)}(A \leftrightarrow B) \stackrel{?}{=} 2E^{AB}\mathbf{1} , \quad (4.B.1)$$

where the “ $\star$ ” denotes a Fermionic multiplication, $\varepsilon(\star) = 1$, cf. question 3 in the Introduction. We will now expose some of the weaknesses of the proposal (4.B.1). (A question mark “?” on top of an equality sign “=” indicates that a formula may be ultimately wrong.) It follows from eq. (1.0.6) that the form degree of the $\star$ multiplication must vanish, $p(\star) = 0$. Let us assume that the $\star$ multiplication is invertible and commute with the Γ^A matrices,

$$\Gamma^A \star - (-1)^{\varepsilon(\Gamma^A)} \star \Gamma^A \equiv [\Gamma^A, \star] \stackrel{?}{=} 0 . \quad (4.B.2)$$

Then one can bring the Clifford algebra (4.B.1) on a Riemannian form,

$$\Gamma^A \Gamma^B + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) = 2g^{AB}\mathbf{1} , \quad (4.B.3)$$

where the Riemannian metric g^{AB} is a product of $\star^{-1}$ and the antisymplectic metric E^{AB} ,

$$g^{AB} := (-1)^{\varepsilon(\Gamma^A)} \star^{-1} E^{AB} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \quad \varepsilon(g^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B . \quad (4.B.4)$$

The Riemannian structure (4.B.4) is non-commutative,

$$[g^{AB}, g^{CD}] = -2(-1)^{\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C} \star^{-2} E^{AB} E^{CD} \neq 0 , \quad (4.B.5)$$

since $[\star^{-1}, \star^{-1}] = 2\star^{-2} \neq 0$, and hence the metric (4.B.4) is not a classical Riemannian metric. We would like to interpret the left-hand side of eq. (4.B.3) as a commutator $[\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B]$, cf. definition (1.1.3). This implies that the Grassmann- and form-parity of the Γ^A matrices are

$$\varepsilon(\Gamma^A) = \varepsilon_A , \quad p(\Gamma^A) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (4.B.6)$$

The only natural candidate for a Berezin–Fradkin operator representation [30, 31] is

$$\Gamma^A = C^A + g^{AB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial C^B} \equiv C^A - P^A \star^{-1} , \quad \varepsilon(C^A) = \varepsilon_A , \quad p(C^A) = 1 , \quad (4.B.7)$$

where the C^A variables commute with the $\star$ multiplication, $[C^A, \star] = 0$, and they carry the same Grassmann- and form-parities as the Γ^A matrices. The P^A derivatives are defined in eq. (4.8.1). However, the Berezin–Fradkin operator representation (4.B.7) does not satisfy the Clifford algebra (4.B.3) due to the non-commutative metric (4.B.5). The representation does also violate the commutation relation (4.B.2). There appear extra terms on the respective right-hand sides,

$$[\Gamma^A, \star^{-1}] = -2\star^{-2} P^A , \quad (4.B.8)$$

$$[\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B] = 2g^{AB}\mathbf{1} - 2\star^{-2} P^A P^B (-1)^{\varepsilon_B} . \quad (4.B.9)$$

The original antisymplectic Clifford algebra (4.B.1) looks even more complicated:

$$\frac{1}{2} \Gamma^A \star \Gamma^B - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)}(A \leftrightarrow B) = S_+^{AB} - E^{AB}\mathbf{1} + P^A P^B \star^{-1} . \quad (4.B.10)$$

One idea would be to try to correct the Clifford algebra (4.B.9) by adding higher-order terms $\mathcal{O}(\star^{-2})$ to the Berezin–Fradkin operator representation (4.B.7), but unfortunately there is no obvious way

to do that. Another idea is to take the limit $\star^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ in some appropriate way at the end of the calculations. The approach that we shall pursue in this paper is to take $\theta \equiv \star^{-1}$ as a fundamental object, *i.e.*, forgetting that it originally was an inverse of $\star$, and then assume that it is nilpotent $\theta^2 = \star^{-2} = 0$. Then the Γ^A matrices and the θ variable commute $[\Gamma^A, \theta] = 0$, the Riemannian metric (4.B.4) becomes an ordinary commutative structure, and the Clifford algebra (4.B.3) is restored. The price is that the Fermionic $\star$ multiplication (4.B.1), which ironically was our initial clue, does not exist.

5 General Spin Theory

5.1 Spin Manifold

Let W be a vector space of the same dimension as the manifold M . Let the vectors (=points) in W have coordinates w^a of Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(w^a) = \varepsilon_a$ (and form-degree $p(w^a) = 0$). It is assumed that the *flat* index “ a ” (denoted with a small roman letter) of the vector space W runs over the same index-set as the *curved* index “ A ” (denoted with a capital roman letter) of the manifold M . In a slight misuse of notation, let $TW := M \times W$ (resp. $T^*W := M \times W^*$) denote the trivial vector bundle over M with the vector space W (resp. dual vector space W^*) as fiber. Let ∂_a^r and $\overrightarrow{dw}^a$ denote dual bases in W and W^* , respectively, of Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(\overrightarrow{dw}^a) = \varepsilon_a = \varepsilon(\partial_a^r)$. The form-parities $p(\overrightarrow{dw}^a) = p(\partial_a^r)$ are either all 0 or all 1, depending on applications, whereas a 1-form dw^a with no arrow “ $\rightarrow$ ” always carries odd form-parity $p(dw^a) = 1$ (and Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(dw^a) = \varepsilon_a$).

Let us assume that M is a spin manifold, *i.e.*, that there exists a bijective bundle map

$$e = \partial_a^r e^a_A \overrightarrow{dz}^A : \Gamma(TM) \rightarrow \Gamma(TW) , \quad (5.1.1)$$

$$e^{-1} = \partial_A^r e^A_a \overrightarrow{dw}^a : \Gamma(TW) \rightarrow \Gamma(TM) . \quad (5.1.2)$$

The intertwining tensor field e^a_A is known as a vielbein. (There are topological obstructions for the existence of a global vielbein. However, it would be out of scope to describe global notions for supermanifolds here, such as, orientability and Stiefel–Whitney classes. The interesting topic of index theorems for Dirac operators will for similar reasons be omitted in this paper.)

Note that the superdeterminant $\text{sdet}(e^a_A) \neq 0$ of the vielbein transforms as a density under general coordinate transformations. In general, the vielbein e^a_A is called compatible with the measure density ρ , if

$$\rho \sim \text{sdet}(e^a_A) \quad (5.1.3)$$

is proportional to the vielbein superdeterminant $\text{sdet}(e^a_A)$ with a z -independent proportionality factor. In this case, the notion of volume is unique (up to an overall rescaling).

5.2 Spin Connection $\nabla^{(\omega)} = d + \omega$

A connection $\nabla^{(\omega)} = d + \omega : \Gamma(TM) \times \Gamma(TW) \rightarrow \Gamma(TW)$ in the bundle TW is known as a spin connection, where

$$\nabla_A^{(\omega)} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \partial_b^r \omega^b_{Ac} \overrightarrow{dw}^c . \quad (5.2.1)$$

The total connection $\nabla = d + \Gamma + \omega$ contains both a Christoffel symbol Γ^B_{AC} , which acts on curved indices, and a spin connection ω^b_{Ac} , which acts on flat indices. We will always demand that the total

connection ∇ preserves the vielbein

$$0 = (\nabla_A e^b{}_C) = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} e^b{}_C \right) - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} e^b{}_B \Gamma^B{}_{AC} + \omega_A{}^b{}_c e^c{}_C. \quad (5.2.2)$$

This condition (5.2.2) fixes uniquely the spin connection as

$$\omega^b{}_{Ac} := \Gamma^b{}_{Ac} - f^b{}_{Ac}, \quad (5.2.3)$$

$$\omega_A{}^b{}_c := \Gamma_A{}^b{}_c - f_A{}^b{}_c = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \omega^b{}_{Ac}, \quad (5.2.4)$$

$$\omega_a{}^b{}_c := \Gamma_a{}^b{}_c - f_a{}^b{}_c = (e^T)_a{}^A \omega_A{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.5)$$

$$\omega^b{}_{ac} := \Gamma^b{}_{ac} - f^b{}_{ac} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} \omega_a{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.6)$$

where

$$\Gamma^b{}_{Ac} := e^b{}_B \Gamma^B{}_{AC} e^C{}_c, \quad (5.2.7)$$

$$\Gamma_A{}^b{}_c := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \Gamma^b{}_{Ac}, \quad (5.2.8)$$

$$\Gamma_a{}^b{}_c := (e^T)_a{}^A \Gamma_A{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.9)$$

$$\Gamma^b{}_{ac} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} \Gamma_a{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.10)$$

$$f_A{}^b{}_c := \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} e^b{}_D \right) e^D{}_c, \quad (5.2.11)$$

$$f^b{}_{Ac} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} f_A{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.12)$$

$$f_a{}^b{}_c := (e^T)_a{}^A f_A{}^b{}_c, \quad (5.2.13)$$

$$f^b{}_{ac} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} f_a{}^b{}_c. \quad (5.2.14)$$

Here the transposed vielbein is

$$(e^T)_A{}^a := (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a + 1)\varepsilon_A} e^a{}_A. \quad (5.2.15)$$

The condition (5.2.2) implies in many cases that one can transfer concepts/objects back and forth between TM and TW by simply multiplying with appropriate factors of the vielbein. Firstly, the spin connection $\nabla_A^{(\omega)} : \Gamma(TW) \rightarrow \Gamma(TW)$ can in a certain sense be thought of as the connection $\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} : \Gamma(TM) \rightarrow \Gamma(TM)$ conjugated with the vielbein $e : \Gamma(TM) \rightarrow \Gamma(TW)$, *i.e.*, roughly speaking a product of three matrices,

$$\begin{aligned} e \nabla_A^{(\Gamma)} e^{-1} &= \partial_b^r e^b{}_B \overrightarrow{dz}^B \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \partial_D^r \Gamma^D{}_{AE} \overrightarrow{dz}^E \right) \partial_C^r e^C{}_c \overrightarrow{dw}^c \\ &= \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_D} \partial_b^r e^b{}_D \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} e^D{}_c \right) \overrightarrow{dw}^c + \partial_b^r \Gamma^b{}_{Ac} \overrightarrow{dw}^c \stackrel{(5.2.2)}{=} \nabla_A^{(\omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.16)$$

Secondly, the torsion tensors $T^{(\omega)b}{}_{AC}$ for the $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ connection is equal to the torsion tensor $T^{(\Gamma)B}{}_{AC}$ for the $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ connection up to a vielbein factor:

$$T^{(\omega)a}{}_{BC} = e^a{}_A T^{(\Gamma)A}{}_{BC}. \quad (5.2.17)$$

This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(\omega)} &\equiv \frac{1}{2} dz^A \wedge \partial_b^r T^{(\omega)b}{}_{AC} dz^C := [\nabla^{(\omega)} \wedge e] = [dz^A \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + dz^A \partial_b^r \omega^b{}_{Ad} \overrightarrow{dw}^d \wedge \partial_c^r e^c{}_C dz^C] \\ &= dz^A \wedge \partial_b^r \left((-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} e^b{}_C + \omega^b{}_{Ac} e^c{}_C \right) dz^C \stackrel{(5.2.2)}{=} dz^A \wedge \partial_b^r e^b{}_B \Gamma^B{}_{AC} dz^C \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} dz^A \wedge \partial_b^r e^b_B T^{(\Gamma)B}_{AC} dz^C . \quad (5.2.18)$$

In particular, the two connections $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ and $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ are torsionfree at the same time.

Thirdly, if the $\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)}$ connection and the vielbein e^a_A are both compatible with the density ρ , cf. eqs. (2.3.3) and (5.1.3), then the spin connection $\nabla_A^{(\omega)}$ becomes traceless,

$$\omega_A{}^b{}_b (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} \stackrel{(5.2.2)}{=} 0 . \quad (5.2.19)$$

Fourthly, the two Riemann curvature tensor $R^{(\Gamma)}$ and $R^{(\omega)}$ are related, see next Subsection 5.3. Fifthly, the two connections $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ and $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ respect an additional structure, such as a Riemannian (resp. an antisymplectic) structure at the same time, cf. Subsection 6.1 (resp. Subsection 7.1).

5.3 Spin Curvature

The spin curvature $R^{(\omega)}$ is defined as (half) the commutator of the $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ connection (5.2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(\omega)} &= \frac{1}{2} [\nabla^{(\omega)} \wedge \nabla^{(\omega)}] = -\frac{1}{2} dz^B \wedge dz^A \otimes [\nabla_A^{(\omega)}, \nabla_B^{(\omega)}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} dz^B \wedge dz^A \otimes \partial_d^r R^{(\omega)d}_{ABc} \overrightarrow{dw^c} , \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(\omega)d}_{ABc} &= \overrightarrow{dw^d} ([\nabla_A^{(\omega)}, \nabla_B^{(\omega)}] \partial_c^r) \\ &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_d \varepsilon_A} (\overrightarrow{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^A}} \omega^d_{Bc}) + \omega^d_{Ae} \omega^e_{Bc} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B) . \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.2)$$

The two types of Riemann curvature tensors $R^{(\Gamma)}$ and $R^{(\omega)}$ are equal up to conjugation with vielbein factors

$$R^{(\omega)d}_{ABc} = e^d_D R^{(\Gamma)D}_{ABC} e^C_c , \quad (5.3.3)$$

basically because curvature is a commutator of connections,

$$\begin{aligned} e \partial_D^r R^{(\Gamma)D}_{ABC} dz^C e^{-1} &= e [\nabla_A^{(\Gamma)}, \nabla_B^{(\Gamma)}] e^{-1} \stackrel{(5.2.16)}{=} [\nabla_A^{(\omega)}, \nabla_B^{(\omega)}] \\ &= \partial_d^r R^{(\omega)d}_{ABc} \overrightarrow{dw^c} . \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.4)$$

5.4 Covariant Tensors with Flat Indices

Let

$$\Omega_{mn}(W) := \Gamma \left(\bigwedge^m (T^*W) \otimes \bigvee^n (T^*W) \right) \quad (5.4.1)$$

be the vector space of $(0, m+n)$ -tensors $\eta_{a_1 \dots a_m b_1 \dots b_n}(z)$ that are antisymmetric with respect to the first m indices $a_1 \dots a_m$, and symmetric with respect to the last n indices $b_1 \dots b_n$. As usual, it is practical to introduce a coordinate-free notation

$$\eta(z; c; y) = \frac{1}{m!n!} c^{a_m} \wedge \dots \wedge c^{a_1} \eta_{a_1 \dots a_m b_1 \dots b_n}(z) \otimes y^{b_n} \vee \dots \vee y^{b_1} . \quad (5.4.2)$$

Here the variables y^a are symmetric counterparts to the one-form basis $c^a \equiv dw^a$.

$$\begin{aligned} c^a \wedge c^b &= -(-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} c^b \wedge c^a , & \varepsilon(c^a) &= \varepsilon_a , & p(c^a) &= 1 , \\ y^a \vee y^b &= (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} y^b \vee y^a , & \varepsilon(y^a) &= \varepsilon_a , & p(y^a) &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (5.4.3)$$

The covariant derivative can be realized on covariant tensors $\eta \in \Omega_{mn}(W)$ by a linear differential operator

$$\nabla_A^{(t)} := \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \omega_A{}^b{}_c t^c{}_b, \quad (5.4.4)$$

where

$$t^a{}_b := c^a \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial c^b} + y^a \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial y^b} \quad (5.4.5)$$

are generators of the Lie-algebra $gl(W)$, which reflects infinitesimal change of frame/basis in W , cf. eq. (2.7.6). The relation with the $\nabla_A^{(T)}$ realization (2.7.4) is

$$\nabla_A^{(T)} \eta(z; e^b{}_B C^B; e^c{}_C Y^C) = (\nabla_A^{(t)} \eta)(z; c; y) \Bigg|_{\substack{c^b = e^b{}_B C^B \\ y^c = e^c{}_C Y^C}}, \quad (5.4.6)$$

because of condition (5.2.2), where $\eta = \eta(z; c; y) \in \Omega_{\bullet\bullet}(W)$ is a flat covariant tensor. The relationship (5.4.6) between the $\nabla^{(T)}$ and the $\nabla^{(t)}$ realizations, where one puts $c^b = e^b{}_B C^B$ and $y^c = e^c{}_C Y^C$, is of course just a particular case of the more general correspondence (5.2.16) between the $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ and the $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ connections.

5.5 Local Gauge Transformations

Consider for simplicity a flat one-form $\eta = \eta_a(z) c^a \in \Omega_{10}(W)$. The covariant derivative reads

$$(\nabla_A \eta)_c = \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \eta_c \right) - \eta_b \omega^b{}_{Ac}. \quad (5.5.1)$$

Under a local gauge transformation

$$\eta_a = \eta'_b \Lambda^b{}_a, \quad c'^a = c^a, \quad (5.5.2)$$

where the group element $\Lambda^a{}_b = \Lambda^a{}_b(z)$ is z -dependent, the spin connection $\omega^b{}_{Ac}$ obeys the well-known affine transformation law for gauge potentials,

$$\Lambda^b{}_a \omega^a{}_{Ac} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \left(\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} \Lambda^b{}_c \right) + \omega'^b{}_{Ad} \Lambda^d{}_c, \quad (5.5.3)$$

so that the covariant derivative transforms covariantly,

$$(\nabla_A \eta)_a = (\nabla_A \eta')_b \Lambda^b{}_a. \quad (5.5.4)$$

6 Riemannian Spin Geometry

6.1 Spin Geometry

Assume that the vector space W is endowed with a constant Riemannian metric

$$g^{(0)} = y^a g_{ab}^{(0)} \vee y^b \in \Omega_{02}(W), \quad (6.1.1)$$

called the *flat* metric. It has Grassmann-parity

$$\varepsilon(g_{ab}^{(0)}) = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b, \quad \varepsilon(g^{(0)}) = 0, \quad p(g_{AB}^{(0)}) = 0, \quad (6.1.2)$$

and symmetry

$$g_{ba}^{(0)} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_a+1)(\varepsilon_b+1)} g_{ab}^{(0)} . \quad (6.1.3)$$

Furthermore, assume that the vielbein e^a_A intertwines between the curved g_{AB} metric and the flat $g_{ab}^{(0)}$ metric:

$$g_{AB} = (e^T)_A{}^a g_{ab}^{(0)} e^b_B . \quad (6.1.4)$$

As a consequence, the canonical Riemannian density (3.1.10) is compatible with the vielbein, *i.e.*, it is proportional to the vielbein superdeterminant,

$$\rho_g := \sqrt{\text{sdet}(g_{AB})} = \sqrt{\text{sdet}(g_{ab}^{(0)}) \text{sdet}(e^a_A)} \sim \text{sdet}(e^a_A) , \quad (6.1.5)$$

cf. eq. (5.1.3). A spin connection $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ is called *metric*, if it preserves the flat metric,

$$0 = -\nabla_A^{(\omega)} g_{bc}^{(0)} = \omega_{A,bc} - (-1)^{(\varepsilon_b+1)(\varepsilon_c+1)} \omega_{A,cb} , \quad (6.1.6)$$

i.e., the lowered $\omega_{A,bc}$ symbol should be skewsymmetric in the flat indices. Here we have lowered the $\omega_{A,bc}$ symbol with the flat metric

$$\omega_{A,bc} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \omega_{bAc} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} , \quad \omega_{bAc} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} := g_{bd}^{(0)} \omega^d_{Ac} . \quad (6.1.7)$$

In particular, the two connections $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ and $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ are metric at the same time, as a consequence of the correspondence (5.2.2) and (6.1.4). Note that we shall from now on put the y^a variables to zero $y^a \rightarrow 0$ everywhere, in analogy with the Y^a variables of Subsection 3.13.

6.2 Levi–Civita Spin Connection

The Levi–Civita spin connection $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ is by definition the unique spin connection that corresponds to the Levi–Civita connection $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ via the identifications (5.2.2) and (6.1.4). It is both torsionfree $T^{(\omega)}=0$ and preserves the metric (6.1.6). The Levi–Civita formula for the spin connection in terms of the vielbein reads

$$-2\omega_{bac} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} f_{a[bc]} + (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b) \varepsilon_c} f_{c[ba]} + f_{b[ac]} , \quad (6.2.1)$$

where

$$f_{bac} := g_{bd}^{(0)} f^d_{ac} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} , \quad \omega_{bac} := g_{bd}^{(0)} \omega^d_{ac} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} , \quad (6.2.2)$$

and where $f_{a[bc]} := f_{abc} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_b \varepsilon_c} f_{acb}$, cf. eqs. (5.2.11)–(5.2.14).

6.3 First–Order s^{ab} Matrices

Because of the presence of the flat metric $g_{(0)}^{ab}$, the symmetry of the general linear Lie–algebra $gl(W)$ reduces to an orthogonal Lie–subalgebra $o(W)$. Its generators $s_{\mp}^{ab}$ read

$$s_{\mp}^{ab} := c^a p^b \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b) , \quad p^a := g_{(0)}^{ab} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial c^b} , \quad (6.3.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(s_{\mp}^{ab}) = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b , \quad p(s_{\mp}^{ab}) = 0 , \quad (6.3.2)$$

$$s_{\mp c}^a := s_{\mp}^{ab} g_{bc}^{(0)} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} . \quad (6.3.3)$$

The transposed operator of a differential operator that depend on the flat c^a -variables is now defined to imitate integration by part. (This becomes important in Lemma 6.4 below.) Explicitly, the transposed fundamental operators are

$$\mathbf{1}^T = \mathbf{1} , \quad (c^a)^T = c^a , \quad (p^a)^T = -p^a . \quad (6.3.4)$$

Therefore the transposed $s_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices read

$$(s_-^{ab})^T = -s_-^{ab} , \quad (s_+^{ab})^T = 2g_{(0)}^{ab} \mathbf{1} - s_+^{ab} . \quad (6.3.5)$$

The $\nabla_A^{(t)}$ realization (5.4.4) can be identically rewritten into the following s^{ab} matrix realization

$$\nabla_A^{(s)} := \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_{A,bc} s_-^{cb} (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_A^b{}_c s_{-b}^c , \quad (6.3.6)$$

i.e., $\nabla_A^{(t)} = \nabla_A^{(s)}$ for a metric spin connection. One gets a projection onto the s_-^{ab} matrices (rather than the s_+^{ab} matrices), because a metric spin connection $\omega_{A,bc}$ is antisymmetric, cf. eq. (6.1.6). Note that in the s^{ab} representation — not only the connection (6.3.6) — but also the curvature — carries a minus-a-half normalization:

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \nabla_B^{(s)}] = -\frac{1}{2} R_{AB}{}^d{}_c s_{-d}^c . \quad (6.3.7)$$

This can be explained as follows: The minus sign is caused by that the s^{ab} representation acts on covariant tensors (as opposed to contravariant tensors), and the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ because the $t^a{}_b$ generator (5.4.5) becomes $\frac{1}{2} s_{-b}^a$ after the metric symmetrization.

The s_-^{ab} matrices satisfy an $o(W)$ Lie-algebra:

$$[s_{\mp}^{ab}, s_{\mp}^{cd}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a(\varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c)} \left(g_{(0)}^{bc} s_-^{ad} + s_-^{bc} g_{(0)}^{ad} \right) \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b) . \quad (6.3.8)$$

6.4 γ^a Matrices And Clifford Algebras

The flat γ^a matrices can be defined via a Berezin–Fradkin operator representation [30, 31]

$$\gamma_\lambda^a \equiv \gamma^a := c^a + \lambda p^a , \quad \varepsilon(\gamma^a) = \varepsilon_a , \quad p(\gamma^a) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (6.4.1)$$

The transposed γ^a matrices correspond to a change in the parameter $\lambda \leftrightarrow -\lambda$:

$$(\gamma^a)^T := c^a - \lambda p^a = \gamma_{-\lambda}^a . \quad (6.4.2)$$

The γ^a matrices satisfy a Clifford algebra

$$[\gamma^a, \gamma^b] = 2\lambda g_{(0)}^{ab} \mathbf{1} . \quad (6.4.3)$$

The γ^a matrices commute with the transposed $(\gamma^b)^T$ matrices

$$[\gamma^a, (\gamma^b)^T] = 0 . \quad (6.4.4)$$

Let V be the vector space

$$V := \text{span } c^a \oplus \text{span } p^a = \text{span } \gamma^a \oplus \text{span } (\gamma^a)^T , \quad (6.4.5)$$

and let

$$T(V) := \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} V^{\otimes m} = (\text{span } \mathbf{1}) \oplus V \oplus V \otimes V \oplus V \otimes V \otimes V \oplus \dots \quad (6.4.6)$$

be the corresponding tensor algebra. Let $I(V)$ be the two-sided ideal generated by

$$[c^a \otimes c^b] , \quad [p^a \otimes c^b] - g^{ab} \mathbf{1} , \quad [p^a \otimes p^b] , \quad (6.4.7)$$

or equivalently, the two-sided ideal generated by

$$[\gamma^a \otimes \gamma^b] - 2g^{ab} \mathbf{1} , \quad [\gamma^a \otimes (\gamma^b)^T] , \quad [(\gamma^a)^T \otimes (\gamma^b)^T] + 2g^{ab} \mathbf{1} . \quad (6.4.8)$$

Then the Heisenberg algebra, or equivalently, the Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(V)$ is isomorphic to the quotient

$$\text{Cl}(V) \cong T(V)/I(V) . \quad (6.4.9)$$

Each element of $\text{Cl}(V)$ is a differential operator in the c^a -variables, and may be Wick/normal-ordered in a unique way, so that all the c -derivatives (the p 's) stands to the right of all the c 's. This is also known as cp -ordering.

There is another important description of the Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(V)$ as a tensor product of two (mutually commutative) Clifford algebras

$$\text{Cl}(V) \cong \text{Cl}(\gamma) \otimes \text{Cl}(\gamma^T) , \quad (6.4.10)$$

where

$$\text{Cl}(\gamma) = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{span } \gamma^{a_1} \gamma^{a_2} \dots \gamma^{a_m} \cong T(\gamma)/I(\gamma) , \quad (6.4.11)$$

$$\text{Cl}(\gamma^T) = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{span } (\gamma^{a_1})^T (\gamma^{a_2})^T \dots (\gamma^{a_m})^T \cong T(\gamma^T)/I(\gamma^T) . \quad (6.4.12)$$

Since the γ matrices commute with the transposed γ^T matrices, it is possible to unshuffle an arbitrary element in $\text{Cl}(V)$ into a $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered form, *i.e.*, so that all the γ matrices stand to the left of all the γ^T matrices. For instance, the $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered form of the γ^a and the $(\gamma^a)^T$ matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^a &= \gamma^a \otimes \mathbf{1} , \\ (\gamma^a)^T &= \mathbf{1} \otimes (\gamma^a)^T , \end{aligned} \quad (6.4.13)$$

respectively. For more complicated expressions, the $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered form will in general not be unique, since *e.g.*, the γ matrices do not commute among themselves. Nevertheless, the $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordering bears some resemblance with, *e.g.*, the method of holomorphic and antiholomorphic blocks in conformal field theory.

The γ^a matrices form a fundamental representation of the $o(W)$ Lie-algebra (6.3.8):

$$[s_{\mp}^{ab}, \gamma^c] = \gamma_{\pm\lambda}^a g_{(0)}^{bc} \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b) . \quad (6.4.14)$$

As a consequence, if one commutes a metric spin connection (6.3.6) with a flat γ^a matrix, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \gamma^b] = -\omega_A^b{}_c \gamma^c . \quad (6.4.15)$$

A curved γ^A matrix is now defined as a flat γ^a matrix dressed with the inverse vielbein in the obvious way:

$$\gamma^A := e^A{}_a \gamma^a = \gamma^a (e^T)_a{}^A , \quad \varepsilon(\gamma^A) = \varepsilon_A , \quad p(\gamma^A) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (6.4.16)$$

(Similar straightforward rules applies to other objects when switching between flat and curved indices.)

If one commutes a metric spin connection (6.3.6) with a curved γ^A matrix, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \gamma^B] = -\Gamma_A{}^B{}_C \gamma^C , \quad (6.4.17)$$

cf. eqs. (5.2.4) and (6.4.15). The result (6.4.17) can be summarized as saying that the total connection $\nabla = d + \Gamma + \omega$ commutes with the γ^A matrices: $[\nabla_A, \gamma^B] = 0$.

6.5 Dirac Operator $D^{(s)}$

For a general discussion of Dirac operators, see *e.g.*, Ref. [38]. We shall for the remainder of the Section 6 assume that the connection is the Levi–Civita connection.

Central for our discussion are the s^{ab} matrices (6.3.1). They act on flat exterior forms $\eta \in \Omega_{\bullet 0}(W)$, *i.e.*, functions $\eta = \eta(z; c)$ of the z^A and c^a variables.

The Dirac operator $D^{(s)}$ in the s^{ab} representation (6.3.6) is a γ^A matrix (6.4.16) times a covariant derivative (6.3.6)

$$D^{(s)} := \gamma^A \nabla_A^{(s)}, \quad \varepsilon(D^{(s)}) = 0, \quad p(D^{(s)}) = 1 \pmod{2}. \quad (6.5.1)$$

The Laplace operator $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(s)}$ in the s^{ab} representation (6.3.6) is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(s)} &:= (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(s)} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A^{(s)} g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(s)} + \Gamma^A_{AC} g^{CB} \nabla_B^{(s)} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho_g} \nabla_A^{(s)} \rho_g g^{AB} \nabla_B^{(s)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5.2)$$

Theorem 6.1 (*cp*–ordered Weitzenböck formula for flat exterior forms) *The difference between the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(s)}$ and the Laplace operator $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(s)}$ in the s^{ab} representation (6.3.6) is*

$$D^{(s)} D^{(s)} - \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(s)} = -\frac{\lambda}{4} s_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} s_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D} \quad (6.5.3)$$

$$= -\lambda c^A R_{AB} p^B + \frac{\lambda}{2} c^B c^A R_{AB,CD} p^D p^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D}. \quad (6.5.4)$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.1: Almost identical to the proof of Theorem 3.5 because of eq. (5.3.3). □

6.6 Second–Order σ^{ab} Matrices

We now replace the first–order $s_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices (6.3.1) with second–order matrices:

$$\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}(\lambda) \equiv \sigma_{\mp}^{ab} := \frac{1}{4\lambda} \gamma^a \gamma^b \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b) = \sigma_{\mp}^{ab} \otimes \mathbf{1}, \quad (6.6.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}) = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b, \quad p(\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}) = 0, \quad (6.6.2)$$

$$\sigma_{\mp c}^a := \sigma_{\mp}^{ab} g_{bc}^{(0)} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c}. \quad (6.6.3)$$

(The names first– and second–order refer to the number of c^a –derivatives.) The transposed $\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices read

$$(\sigma_{\mp}^{ab})^T = \pm \frac{1}{4\lambda} (\gamma^a)^T (\gamma^b)^T \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b) = \mp \sigma_{\mp}^{ab}(-\lambda) = \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_{\mp}^{ab})^T. \quad (6.6.4)$$

In the last expression of eqs. (6.6.1) and (6.6.4) we wrote the $\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}$ and the $(\sigma_{\mp}^{ab})^T$ matrices on a $\gamma\gamma^T$ –ordered form. In particular, the $\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices decouple completely from the $(\sigma_{\mp}^{ab})^T$ matrices,

$$[\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}, (\sigma_{\mp}^{cd})^T] = 0, \quad [\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}, (\sigma_{\pm}^{cd})^T] = 0. \quad (6.6.5)$$

On one hand, the matrices

$$\sigma_-^{ab} = \frac{1}{4\lambda} \{\gamma^a, \gamma^b\}_+ = \frac{1}{2\lambda} c^a c^b + \frac{1}{2} s_-^{ab} + \frac{\lambda}{2} p^a p^b \quad (6.6.6)$$

satisfy precisely the same non-Abelian $o(W)$ Lie-algebra (6.3.8) and fundamental representation (6.4.14) as the s_-^{ab} matrices. On the other hand, the matrices

$$\sigma_+^{ab} := \frac{1}{4\lambda} [\gamma^a, \gamma^b] \stackrel{(6.4.3)}{=} \frac{1}{2} g_{(0)}^{ab} \mathbf{1} \quad (6.6.7)$$

are proportional to the identity operator, and thus Abelian.

The s_-^{ab} matrices can be expressed in terms of the σ_-^{ab} matrices and their transposed,

$$s_-^{ab} = \sigma_-^{ab} + \sigma_-^{ab}(-\lambda) = \sigma_-^{ab} \otimes \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_-^{ab})^T, \quad (6.6.8)$$

as a consequence of eq. (6.6.6). In contrast, the s_+^{ab} matrices can *not* be expressed in terms of the $\sigma_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices and their transposed.

The first-order $\nabla_A^{(s)}$ realization (6.3.6) can be identically rewritten into the following second-order $\sigma\sigma^T$ matrix realization

$$\nabla_A^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} := \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_{A,bc} \left(\sigma_-^{cb} \otimes \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_-^{cb})^T \right) (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} = \frac{\vec{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_A{}^b{}_c \left(\sigma_{-b}^c \otimes \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_{-b}^c)^T \right), \quad (6.6.9)$$

i.e., $\nabla_A^{(t)} = \nabla_A^{(s)} = \nabla_A^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ for a metric spin connection. In contrast, the first-order $\nabla_A^{(S)}$ realization (3.12.6) does in general not have a second-order formulation for a metric connection, even if the manifold is a spin manifold, cf. Appendix 3.A. This is despite the fact that the first-order realizations $\nabla_A^{(S)}$ and $\nabla_A^{(s)}$ are closely related via condition (5.2.2),

$$\nabla_A^{(S)} \eta(z; e^b{}_B C^B) = \left(\nabla_A^{(s)} \eta \right)(z; c) \Big|_{c^b = e^b{}_B C^B}, \quad (6.6.10)$$

where $\eta = \eta(z; c; y) \in \Omega_{\bullet 0}(W)$ is a flat exterior form. Here the $S_{\mp}^{AB}$ and $s_{\mp}^{ab}$ matrices act by adjoint action on the C^C and c^c variables as

$$[S_{\mp}^{AB}, C^C] = C^A g^{BC} \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} (A \leftrightarrow B), \quad [s_{\mp}^{ab}, c^c] = c^a g_{(0)}^{bc} \mp (-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} (a \leftrightarrow b), \quad (6.6.11)$$

cf. eqs. (3.11.1) and (6.3.1), respectively. The crucial difference is that the $\nabla_A^{(S)}$ realization (3.12.6) contains a non-trivial S_+ sector, while the $\nabla_A^{(s)}$ realization (6.3.6) has *no* s_+ sector. This has its root in the fact that the flat metric condition (6.1.6) is an algebraic condition, while the curved metric condition (3.6.1) is a differential condition. (Curiously, it is just opposite for the torsionfree conditions: the curved torsionfree condition is an algebraic condition, while the flat torsionfree condition is a differential condition, cf. eqs. (2.2.2) and (5.2.18).)

6.7 Lichnerowicz' Formula

It is convenient to define a totally symmetrized combination of three γ^a matrices as

$$\gamma^{a_1 a_2 a_3} := \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\pi \in S_3} (-1)^{\varepsilon_{\pi, a}} \gamma^{a_{\pi(1)}} \gamma^{a_{\pi(2)}} \gamma^{a_{\pi(3)}}, \quad (6.7.1)$$

where $(-1)^{\varepsilon_{\pi,a}}$ is the sign factor that arises when one does a π -permutation of three supercommuting objects with the same Grassmann- and form-parity as the γ^a matrices, say, the c 's

$$c^{a_1} \wedge c^{a_2} \wedge c^{a_3} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_{\pi,a}} c^{a_{\pi(1)}} \wedge c^{a_{\pi(2)}} \wedge c^{a_{\pi(3)}} , \quad (6.7.2)$$

cf. (5.4.3). The symmetrized γ^{abc} matrix can be reduced with the help of the Clifford relation (6.4.3) as

$$\gamma^{abc} = \gamma^a \gamma^b \gamma^c - \lambda g_{(0)}^{ab} \gamma^c + (-1)^{\varepsilon_b \varepsilon_c} \lambda g_{(0)}^{ac} \gamma^b - \gamma^a \lambda g_{(0)}^{bc} . \quad (6.7.3)$$

Theorem 6.2 ($\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered Lichnerowicz' formula [6]) *The square of the Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ in the $\sigma\sigma^T$ representation (6.6.1) is*

$$D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} = \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} - \frac{\lambda}{4} R + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sigma_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} \otimes (\sigma_-^{DC})^T (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D} . \quad (6.7.4)$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2: One derives that the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ is the Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ plus a curvature term, by proceeding along the lines of the proof of Theorem 3.5:

$$D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} = \frac{1}{2} [D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}, D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}] = \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^B \gamma^A [\nabla_A^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}, \nabla_B^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}] . \quad (6.7.5)$$

When one $\gamma\gamma^T$ -decomposes the curvature term, it splits in two parts:

$$-\frac{1}{2} \gamma^B \gamma^A [\nabla_A^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}, \nabla_B^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}] = \frac{1}{4} \gamma^B \gamma^A R_{AB}{}^d{}_c (\sigma_{-d}^c \otimes \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_{-d}^c)^T) = III + III^T , \quad (6.7.6)$$

where

$$III^T := \frac{\lambda}{2} \sigma_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} \otimes (\sigma_-^{DC})^T (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D} , \quad (6.7.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} III &:= -\frac{1}{4} \gamma^B \gamma^A R_{AB,CD} \sigma_-^{DC} (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D} = -\frac{1}{8\lambda} \gamma^B \gamma^A R_{AB,CD} \gamma^D \gamma^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C + \varepsilon_D} \\ &= \frac{1}{8\lambda} (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B) \varepsilon_C} \gamma^B \gamma^A \gamma^C R_{AB,CD} \gamma^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} \\ &\stackrel{(6.7.3)}{=} \frac{1}{8\lambda} (\gamma^{CBA} + \gamma^C \lambda g^{BA} - \lambda g^{CB} \gamma^A + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_B} \lambda g^{CA} \gamma^B) R_{AB,CD} \gamma^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} g^{CB} \gamma^A R_{AB,CD} \gamma^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} = \frac{1}{4} (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B)(\varepsilon_D + 1)} R_{ABD}{}^B \gamma^A \gamma^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} R_{DA} \gamma^A \gamma^D (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} = -\frac{\lambda}{4} R_{DA} g^{AD} (-1)^{\varepsilon_D} = -\frac{\lambda}{4} R . \end{aligned} \quad (6.7.8)$$

Here the first Bianchi identity (3.7.5) was used one time.

□

6.8 Clifford Representations

The spinor representations $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^T$ can be defined as Fock spaces

$$\mathcal{S} := \text{Cl}(\gamma)|0\rangle = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{span } c^{a_1} c^{a_2} \dots c^{a_m} |0\rangle , \quad p^a |0\rangle = 0 , \quad (6.8.1)$$

$$\mathcal{S}^T := \text{Cl}(\gamma^T)|0^T\rangle = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{span } p^{a_1} p^{a_2} \dots p^{a_m} |0^T\rangle , \quad c^a |0^T\rangle = 0 . \quad (6.8.2)$$

The constraints $p^a|0\rangle=0$ (resp. $c^a|0^T\rangle=0$) are consistent, because the p^a 's (resp. the c^a 's) commute. The representation (6.8.1) and (6.8.2) are of course just two possibilities out of infinitely many equivalent choices of Fock space representations. A different class of vacua $|1\rangle$ and $|1^T\rangle$ are defined via

$$\sigma_-^{ab}|1\rangle = 0, \quad (\sigma_-^{ab})^T|1^T\rangle = 0. \quad (6.8.3)$$

They both represent the singlet/trivial representation of the orthogonal Lie-group $O(W)$. Again, the constraints (6.8.3) for the vacua are consistent, since the σ_-^{ab} (resp. the $(\sigma_-^{ab})^T$) matrices form Lie-algebras. All the above constraints are examples of first-class constraints. More generally, assume that $|\Omega\rangle$ and $|\Omega^T\rangle$ are two arbitrary consistent vacua (that are not necessarily related). Let $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}^T$ denote the corresponding vector spaces

$$\mathcal{V} := \text{Cl}(\gamma)|\Omega\rangle, \quad \mathcal{V}^T := \text{Cl}(\gamma^T)|\Omega^T\rangle. \quad (6.8.4)$$

The Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(V) \cong \text{Cl}(\gamma) \otimes \text{Cl}(\gamma^T)$ is defined to act on the tensor product $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}^T$ via a $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered form, *i.e.*, the γ^a matrices act on the first factor $\mathcal{V}$ and the transposed $(\gamma^a)^T$ matrices act on the second factor $\mathcal{V}^T$. In detail, if $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{V}$ and $|v^T\rangle \in \mathcal{V}^T$ are two (not necessarily related) states, then

$$\gamma^a.(|v\rangle \otimes |v^T\rangle) := (\gamma^a|v\rangle) \otimes |v^T\rangle, \quad (6.8.5)$$

$$(\gamma^a)^T.(|v\rangle \otimes |v^T\rangle) := (-1)^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(\gamma^a) \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}(v)} |v\rangle \otimes (\gamma^a)^T|v^T\rangle. \quad (6.8.6)$$

By definition, $\mathcal{V}$ is a Clifford bundle, while $\mathcal{V}^T$ is a dual/contragredient Clifford bundle.

A Lie-algebra element $x \in \text{so}(W)$ is of the form

$$x = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^{\varepsilon_a} x_{ab} s_-^{ba} = \frac{1}{2} x^a_b s_{-a}^b = \frac{1}{2} x^a_b \left(\sigma_{-a}^b \otimes \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes (\sigma_{-a}^b)^T \right), \quad (6.8.7)$$

where

$$x_{ab} = (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a+1)(\varepsilon_b+1)} (a \leftrightarrow b), \quad x^a_c := g_{(0)}^{ab} x_{bc}. \quad (6.8.8)$$

A $\gamma\gamma^T$ -ordered form of a generic special orthogonal Lie-group element $g=e^x \in SO(W)$ is

$$\exp \left[\frac{1}{2} x^a_b s_{-a}^b \right] = \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} x^a_b \sigma_{-a}^b \right] \otimes \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} x^c_d (\sigma_{-c}^d)^T \right]. \quad (6.8.9)$$

In this way the vector space $\mathcal{V}^T$ becomes a dual/contragredient representation of the special orthogonal Lie-group $SO(W)$, hence the name.

6.9 Intertwining Operator

Consider the intertwining operator

$$s := \int d^N \theta \, e^{\theta_a \gamma^a} \otimes e^{\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T}, \quad (6.9.1)$$

where θ_a are integration variables with Grassmann-parity $\varepsilon(\theta_a) = \varepsilon_a$ and form-parity $p(\theta_a) = 1 \pmod{2}$.

Lemma 6.3 *The intertwining operator s is invariant under the adjoint action $e^x s e^{-x} = s$ of the special orthogonal Lie-group $SO(W)$. Equivalently, the intertwining operator s commute with the $\text{so}(W)$ Lie-algebra generators $[s_-^{ab}, s] = 0$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 6.3: The adjoint action rotates the γ^a matrices,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} x^c_d \sigma^d_{-c} \right] \gamma^a \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} x^e_f \sigma^f_{-e} \right] &= (e^x)^a_b \gamma^b, \\ \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} x^c_d (\sigma^d_{-c})^T \right] (\gamma^a)^T \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} x^e_f (\sigma^f_{-e})^T \right] &= (e^x)^a_b (\gamma^b)^T, \end{aligned} \quad (6.9.2)$$

where

$$(e^x)^a_b := \delta^a_b + x^a_b + \frac{1}{2!} x^a_c x^c_b + \frac{1}{3!} x^a_c x^c_d x^d_b + \frac{1}{4!} x^a_c x^c_d x^d_e x^e_b + \dots \quad (6.9.3)$$

Hence one may change integration variables $\theta_a \rightarrow \theta'_b = \theta_a (e^x)^a_b$ in the integral (6.9.1). The Jacobian vanishes for special orthogonal transformations

$$\ln \text{sdet}(e^x)^a_b = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a} x^a_a = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a} g_{(0)}^{ab} x_{ba} = 0. \quad (6.9.4)$$

□

Lemma 6.4 *The corresponding intertwining state*

$$||s\rangle\rangle := s.(|\Omega\rangle \otimes |\Omega^T\rangle) = \int d^N \theta \, e^{\theta_a \gamma^a} |\Omega\rangle \otimes e^{\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T} |\Omega^T\rangle \quad (6.9.5)$$

is invariant under the action of the special orthogonal Lie-group $SO(W)$. Equivalently, the $so(W)$ Lie-algebra generators s_-^{ab} annihilate the intertwining state $s_-^{ab} ||s\rangle\rangle = 0$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 6.4:

$$\begin{aligned} e^x ||s\rangle\rangle &= \int d^N \theta \, e^{\theta_a \gamma^a} \exp \left[\frac{1}{4\lambda} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} x_{cd} \gamma^d \gamma^c \right] |\Omega\rangle \otimes e^{\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4\lambda} (-1)^{\varepsilon_e} x_{ef} (\gamma^f)^T (\gamma^e)^T \right] |\Omega^T\rangle \\ &= \int d^N \theta \, \exp \left[\frac{1}{4\lambda} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} x_{cd} \tilde{\gamma}^d \tilde{\gamma}^c \right] e^{\theta_a \gamma^a} |\Omega\rangle \otimes \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4\lambda} (-1)^{\varepsilon_e} x_{ef} (\tilde{\gamma}^f)^T (\tilde{\gamma}^e)^T \right] e^{\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T} |\Omega^T\rangle \\ &= ||s\rangle\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (6.9.6)$$

where we have introduced (a kind of) Fourier transformed γ matrices

$$\tilde{\gamma}^a := \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial \theta_a} + g_{(0)}^{ab} \theta_b, \quad (\tilde{\gamma}^a)^T := -\frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial \theta_a} + g_{(0)}^{ab} \theta_b, \quad (6.9.7)$$

which satisfy

$$\tilde{\gamma}^a \exp [\theta_b \gamma^b] = \exp [\theta_b \gamma^b] \gamma^a, \quad -(\tilde{\gamma}^a)^T \exp [\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T] = \exp [\theta_b (\gamma^b)^T] (\gamma^a)^T. \quad (6.9.8)$$

In the last equality of eq. (6.9.6), we performed integration by part, which turns $\tilde{\gamma}^a$ into $(\tilde{\gamma}^a)^T$, and vice-versa.

□

The algebra bundle (6.4.9) of differential operators in the c^a -variables, or equivalently polynomials in γ and γ^T , is isomorphic to the bispinor bundle $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}^T$. The bundle isomorphism is

$$\text{Cl}(V) \cong \text{Cl}(\gamma) \otimes \text{Cl}(\gamma^T) \ni F \xrightarrow{\cong} F ||s\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}^T \cong \text{End}(\mathcal{S}). \quad (6.9.9)$$

The bispinor bundle $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}^T \cong \text{End}(\mathcal{S})$ is, in turn, isomorphic (as vector bundles) to the bundle of endomorphisms: $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. Let us also mention that the Weyl symbol $\xrightarrow{\cong}$ operator isomorphism $\bigwedge^\bullet(V) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Cl}(V)$ from the exterior algebra $(\bigwedge^\bullet(V); *)$, equipped with the Groenewold/Moyal $*$ product, to the Heisenberg algebra $(\text{Cl}(V); \circ)$, is known as the Chevalley isomorphism in the context of Clifford algebras.

6.10 Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz’ Formula

We will be interested in how the Dirac operator acts on a Clifford bundle $\mathcal{V} \otimes |1^T\rangle \cong \mathcal{V}$ and a tensor Clifford bundle $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}^T$.

Theorem 6.5 (Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz’ formula [5, 6]) *On a Clifford bundle $\mathcal{V} \otimes |1^T\rangle \cong \mathcal{V}$, the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma)}$ is equal to the Laplacian $\Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma)}$ minus a quarter of the scalar curvature R ,*

$$D^{(\sigma)} D^{(\sigma)} = \lambda \Delta_{\rho_g}^{(\sigma)} - \frac{\lambda}{4} R . \quad (6.10.1)$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.5: This is a Corollary to Lichnerowicz’ formula (6.7.4). □

The Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz’ formula (6.10.1) corresponds to naively substituting the first-order matrices $s_-^{ab} \rightarrow \sigma_-^{ab}$ in the $\nabla^{(s)}$ realization (6.3.6) with the second-order matrices σ_-^{ab} . The analysis in Subsections 6.6 and 6.8 shows in detail why this replacement is geometrically sound and in fact very natural.

Theorem 6.6 *The square of the Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ on a tensor Clifford bundle $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}^T$ becomes equal to the Laplace–Beltrami operator Δ_{ρ_g} when it is projected on the singlet representation $||s\rangle\rangle$,*

$$D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)} f ||s\rangle\rangle = \lambda (\Delta_{\rho_g} f) ||s\rangle\rangle , \quad (6.10.2)$$

where $f = f(z)$ is an arbitrary scalar function.

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.6: This is a Corollary to the Weitzenböck formula (6.5.3). □

7 Antisymplectic Spin Geometry

7.1 Spin Geometry

Assume that the vector space W is endowed with a constant antisymplectic metric

$$E^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} c^a E_{ab}^{(0)} \wedge c^b = -\frac{1}{2} E_{ab}^{(0)} c^b \wedge c^a \in \Omega_{20}(W) , \quad (7.1.1)$$

called the *flat* metric. It has Grassmann–parity

$$\varepsilon(E_{ab}^{(0)}) = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b + 1 , \quad \varepsilon(E^{(0)}) = 1 , \quad p(E_{AB}^{(0)}) = 0 , \quad (7.1.2)$$

and symmetry

$$E_{ba}^{(0)} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_b} E_{ab}^{(0)} . \quad (7.1.3)$$

Furthermore, assume that the vielbein e^a_A intertwines between the curved E_{AB} metric and the flat $E_{ab}^{(0)}$ metric:

$$E_{AB} = (e^T)_A{}^a E_{ab}^{(0)} e^b_B . \quad (7.1.4)$$

A spin connection $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ is called *antisymplectic*, if it preserves the flat metric,

$$0 = -\nabla_A^{(\omega)} E_{bc}^{(0)} = \omega_{A,bc} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_b \varepsilon_c} \omega_{A,cb} , \quad (7.1.5)$$

i.e., the lowered $\omega_{A,bc}$ symbol should be symmetric in the flat indices. Here we have lowered the $\omega_{A,bc}$ symbol with the flat metric

$$\omega_{A,bc} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A \varepsilon_b} \omega_{bAc} , \quad \omega_{bAc} := E_{bd}^{(0)} \omega^d_{Ac} (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} . \quad (7.1.6)$$

In particular, the two connections $\nabla^{(\Gamma)}$ and $\nabla^{(\omega)}$ are antisymplectic at the same time, as a consequence of the correspondence (5.2.2) and (7.1.4).

7.2 First-Order s^{ab} Matrices

Because of the presence of the flat metric $E_{(0)}^{ab}$, the symmetry of the general linear Lie-algebra $gl(W)$ reduces to an antisymplectic Lie-subalgebra. Its generators $s_{\pm}^{ab}$ read

$$s_{\pm}^{ab} := c^a (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} p^b \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a+1)(\varepsilon_b+1)} (a \leftrightarrow b) , \quad p^a := E_{(0)}^{ab} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial c^b} , \quad (7.2.1)$$

$$\varepsilon(s_{\pm}^{ab}) = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b + 1 , \quad p(s_{\pm}^{ab}) = 0 , \quad (7.2.2)$$

$$s_{\pm c}^a := s_{\pm}^{ab} E_{bc}^{(0)} (-1)^{\varepsilon_c} . \quad (7.2.3)$$

The $\nabla_A^{(t)}$ realization (5.4.4) can be identically rewritten into the following s^{ab} matrix realization

$$\nabla_A^{(s)} := \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} + \frac{1}{2} \omega_{A,bc} s_+^{cb} (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^\ell}{\partial z^A} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_A^b{}_c s_{+b}^c , \quad (7.2.4)$$

i.e., $\nabla_A^{(t)} = \nabla_A^{(s)}$ for an antisymplectic spin connection. One gets a projection onto the s_+^{ab} matrices (rather than the s_-^{ab} matrices), because an antisymplectic spin connection $\omega_{A,bc}$ is symmetric, cf. eq. (7.1.5).

The s_+^{ab} matrices satisfy an antisymplectic Lie-algebra:

$$[s_{\pm}^{ab}, s_{\pm}^{cd}] = (-1)^{\varepsilon_a(\varepsilon_b+\varepsilon_c+1)+\varepsilon_b} \left(E_{(0)}^{bc} s_+^{ad} - s_+^{bc} E_{(0)}^{ad} \right) \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a+1)(\varepsilon_b+1)} (a \leftrightarrow b) . \quad (7.2.5)$$

7.3 γ^a Matrices

The flat γ^a matrices can be defined via a Berezin–Fradkin operator representation [30, 31]

$$\gamma_\theta^a \equiv \gamma^a := c^a + (-1)^{\varepsilon_a} \theta p^a = c^a - p^a \theta , \quad \varepsilon(\gamma^a) = \varepsilon_a , \quad p(\gamma^a) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (7.3.1)$$

The γ^a matrices satisfy a Clifford-like algebra

$$[\gamma^a, \gamma^b] = 2(-1)^{\varepsilon_a} \theta E_{(0)}^{ab} \mathbf{1} . \quad (7.3.2)$$

The γ^a matrices form a fundamental representation of the antisymplectic Lie-algebra (7.2.5):

$$[s_{\pm}^{ab}, \gamma^c] = \gamma_{\pm\theta}^a (-1)^{\varepsilon_b} E_{(0)}^{bc} \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_a+1)(\varepsilon_b+1)} (a \leftrightarrow b) . \quad (7.3.3)$$

As a consequence, if one commutes an antisymplectic spin connection (7.2.4) with a flat γ^a matrix, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \gamma^b] = -\omega_A{}^b{}_c \gamma^c . \quad (7.3.4)$$

Similarly, if one commutes an antisymplectic spin connection (7.2.4) with a curved γ^A matrices, one gets

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \gamma^B] = -\Gamma_A{}^B{}_C \gamma^C , \quad (7.3.5)$$

cf. eqs. (5.2.4) and (7.3.4).

7.4 Dirac Operator $D^{(s)}$

We shall for the remainder of Section 7 assume that the connection is antisymplectic, torsionfree and ρ -compatible.

The Dirac operator $D^{(s)}$ in the s^{ab} representation (7.2.4) is a γ^A matrix (7.3.1) times a covariant derivative (7.2.4)

$$D^{(s)} := \gamma^A \nabla_A^{(s)} , \quad \varepsilon(D^{(s)}) = 0 , \quad p(D^{(s)}) = 1 \pmod{2} . \quad (7.4.1)$$

The odd Laplacian $\Delta_\rho^{(s)}$ in the s representation (7.2.4) is

$$2\Delta_\rho^{(s)} := (-1)^{\varepsilon_A} \nabla_A E^{AB} \nabla_B^{(s)} = \frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon_A}}{\rho} \nabla_A^{(s)} \rho E^{AB} \nabla_B^{(s)} . \quad (7.4.2)$$

Theorem 7.1 (Antisymplectic Weitzenböck type formula for flat exterior forms) *The difference between the square of the Dirac operator $D^{(s)}$ and twice the odd Laplacian $\Delta_\rho^{(s)}$ in the s^{ab} representation (7.2.4) is*

$$D^{(s)} D^{(s)} - 2\theta \Delta_\rho^{(s)} = \frac{\theta}{4} (-1)^{\varepsilon_B + \varepsilon_C} s_-^{BA} R_{AB,CD} s_+^{DC} \quad (7.4.3)$$

$$= -\theta c^A R_{AB} p^B + \frac{\theta}{2} c^B c^A R_{AB,CD} p^D p^C (-1)^{\varepsilon_C} . \quad (7.4.4)$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 7.1: Almost identical to the proof of Theorem 4.4 because of eq. (5.3.3). $\square$

7.A Appendix: Shifted s_+^{ab} Matrices

We have already seen in Appendix 4.A that there are no consistent antisymplectic second-order deformations of the s_+^{ab} matrices. The only remaining deformation is a c -number shift,

$$s_+^{\prime ab} := s_+^{ab} + \alpha E_{(0)}^{ab} \mathbf{1} , \quad (7.A.1)$$

$$s_{+b}^{\prime a} := s_{+b}^a + \alpha (-1)^{\varepsilon_a} \delta_b^a \mathbf{1} , \quad (7.A.2)$$

with a parameter α , cf. eq. (4.8.6). These shifted $s_+^{\prime ab}$ matrices satisfy the same Lie-algebra (7.2.5) and fundamental representation (7.3.3) as the s_+^{ab} matrices. Moreover, the shift does not affect the s^{ab} representation (7.2.4) of the spin connection, because of tracefree condition (5.2.19). Similarly, the curvature

$$[\nabla_A^{(s)}, \nabla_B^{(s)}] = -\frac{1}{2} R_{AB}{}^d{}_c s_{+d}^c . \quad (7.A.3)$$

is unaffected, since the shift-term is proportional to the Ricci two-form $\mathcal{R}_{AB}=0$, which is zero. Thus we conclude that the c -number shift $s_+^{ab} \rightarrow s_+^{\prime ab}$ has no effects at all on the construction.

8 Conclusions

The main objective of the paper is to gain knowledge about the deepest and most profound geometric levels of the field–antifield formalism [1, 2, 3]. It is imperative to better understand the geometric meaning of the odd scalar curvature R , which sits as a zeroth–order term in the odd Δ operator (1.0.1), and which descends to the quantum master equation $\Delta \exp[\frac{i}{\hbar}W] = 0$ as a two–loop contribution:

$$(W, W) = 2i\hbar\Delta_\rho W - \hbar^2 \frac{R}{4} . \quad (8.0.1)$$

We have in this paper investigated the hypothesis that the zeroth–order term $-R/4$ of (twice) the odd Δ operator (1.0.1) is related to the zeroth–order term $-R/4$ in the Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz formula (6.10.1). We have so far been unable to give a closed argument that such relationship exists. In fact, Theorem 6.6 indicates that there is no relation, as explained in the Introduction. Some of the main results of the paper are the following.

- We have classified scalar invariants of suitable dimensions that depend on the density ρ and the metric, cf. Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 4.2.
- We have identified (via a ρ –independence argument) a Riemannian counterpart (3.9.1) of the antisymplectic Δ operator (1.0.1), that takes scalars to scalars, and we have, in terms of formulas, traced the minus–a–quarter coefficient in front of R from the Riemannian to the antisymplectic side, cf. Subsection 4.7.
- We have tied the Riemannian Δ operator (3.5.2) to the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ for a particle moving in a curved Riemannian space, cf. Subsection 3.10.
- We have derived the Laplace–Beltrami operator Δ_{ρ_g} by projecting the square of the bispinor Dirac operator $D^{(\sigma\sigma^T)}$ to a singlet state $||s\rangle\rangle$, cf. Theorem 6.6.
- We have found a first–order formalism for antisymplectic spinors and proved two Weitzenböck–type identities (Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 7.1) that are in exact one–to–one correspondence with their Riemannian siblings (Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 6.1).

However, there is in our approach *no* antisymplectic analogue of the Riemannian second–order formalism and the Schrödinger–Lichnerowicz formula (6.10.1). A bit oversimplified, this is because the canonical choice for antisymplectic second–order $\Sigma_\pm^{AB}$ matrices is

$$\Sigma_\pm^{AB} \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{1}{4} \Gamma^A \star \Gamma^B \mp (-1)^{(\varepsilon_A+1)(\varepsilon_B+1)} (A \leftrightarrow B) , \quad \varepsilon(\Sigma_\pm^{AB}) = \varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_B + 1 , \quad p(\Sigma_\pm^{AB}) = 0 , \quad (8.0.2)$$

where “ $\star$ ” is a Fermionic multiplication, $\varepsilon(\star) = 1$. This choice (8.0.2) meet all the requirements of Grassmann–parity and symmetry, and is a direct analogue of the Riemannian second–order $\Sigma_\pm^{AB}$ matrices (3.A.1). Unfortunately, such $\star$ multiplication does not admit a Berezin–Fradkin representation of the Γ^A matrices, cf. Appendix 4.B. We instead introduced a Fermionic nilpotent parameter θ , which may formally be identified with the inverse $\star^{-1}$, and which serves as a Fermionic analogue of the “Planck constant” λ from the Riemannian case. Then the $\star$ multiplication itself should be identified with the inverse θ^{-1} , which is an ill–defined quantity, and hence the above formula (8.0.2) for the $\Sigma_\pm^{AB}$ matrices does not make sense. Note however that the nilpotent θ parameter breaks the non–degeneracy of the Clifford algebra (4.9.2).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: We would like to thank Poul Henrik Damgaard, the Niels Bohr Institute and the Niels Bohr International Academy for warm hospitality. I.A.B. would also like to thank Michal Lenc and the Masaryk University for warm hospitality. The work of I.A.B. and K.B. is supported by the Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic under the project MSM 0021622409. The work of I.A.B. is supported by grants RFBR 08–01–00737, RFBR 08–02–01118 and LSS–1615.2008.2.

References

- [1] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **102B** (1981) 27.
- [2] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2567 [E: **D30** (1984) 508].
- [3] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 106.
- [4] I.A. Batalin and K. Bering, J. Math. Phys. **49** (2008) 033515, arXiv:0708.0400.
- [5] E. Schrödinger, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wissen. Phys.–Math. **11** (1932) 105.
- [6] A. Lichnerowicz, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. **A257** (1963) 7.
- [7] B.S. DeWitt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29** (1957) 377.
- [8] B.S. DeWitt, in *Relativity, Group and Topology*, Les Houches 1963, Eds. B.S. DeWitt and C. DeWitt, Gordon Breach, New York, 1964; *Relativity, Group and Topology II*, Les Houches 1983, Eds. B.S. DeWitt and R. Stora, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [9] F.A. Berezin, Theor. Math. Phys. **6** (1971) 194.
- [10] M. Mizrahi, J. Math. Phys. **16** (1975) 2201.
- [11] J.-L. Gervais and A. Jevicki, Nucl. Phys. **B110** (1976) 93.
- [12] B.S. DeWitt, *Supermanifolds*, 2nd Eds, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [13] B. Peeters and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, in the proceedings of *HEP Europhysics conference*, Marseille, (1993) 98, arXiv:hep-th/9312147.
- [14] J. de Boer, B. Peeters, K. Skenderis and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. **B446** (1995) 211, arXiv:hep-th/9504097.
- [15] F. Bastianelli, K. Schalm and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 044002, arXiv:hep-th/9801105.
- [16] F. Bastianelli, *Path integrals in curved space and the worldline formalism*, in the proceedings of *8th international conference on path integrals: from quantum information to cosmology*, Prague, Czech Republic, 6–10 June 2005, arXiv:hep-th/0508205.
- [17] O.M. Khudaverdian, arXiv:math.DG/9909117.
- [18] O.M. Khudaverdian and Th. Voronov, Lett. Math. Phys. **62** (2002) 127, arXiv:math.DG/0205202.
- [19] O.M. Khudaverdian, Contemp. Math. **315** (2002) 199, arXiv:math.DG/0212354.
- [20] O.M. Khudaverdian, Commun. Math. Phys. **247** (2004) 353, arXiv:math.DG/0012256.

- [21] I.A. Batalin, K. Bering and P.H. Damgaard, Nucl. Phys. **B739** (2006) 389, arXiv:hep-th/0512131.
- [22] K. Bering, J. Math. Phys. **47** (2006) 123513, arXiv:hep-th/0604117.
- [23] K. Bering, J. Math. Phys. **49** (2008) 043516, arXiv:0705.3440.
- [24] Y. Kosmann–Schwarzbach and J. Monterde, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **52** (2002) 419, arXiv:math.QA/0002209.
- [25] K. Bering, arXiv:physics/9711010.
- [26] B. Geyer and P.M. Lavrov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A19** (2004) 3195, arXiv:hep-th/0306218.
- [27] O.M. Khudaverdian and Th. Voronov, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. **2-212** (2004) 179, arXiv:math.DG/0212311.
- [28] N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Geometric Quantization*, 2nd Ed, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.
- [29] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare Phys. Theor. **49** (1988) 145.
- [30] F.A. Berezin, see footnote in Ref. [31].
- [31] E.S. Fradkin, Nucl. Phys. **76** (1966) 588.
- [32] B. Kostant, Symposia Mathematica **XIV** (1974) 139.
- [33] M. Reuter, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A13** (1998) 3835, arXiv:hep-th/9804036.
- [34] K. Bering, SIGMA **5** (2009) 036, arXiv:0803.4201.
- [35] P.M. Lavrov and O.V. Radchenko, arXiv:0708.4270.
- [36] M. Asorey and P.M. Lavrov, arXiv:0803.1591.
- [37] I.A. Batalin and K. Bering, Phys. Lett. **B663** (2008) 132, arXiv:0712.3699.
- [38] N. Berline, E. Getzler and M. Vergne, *Heat Kernels and Dirac Operators*, Springer, Berlin, 1992.